SCROLLS

ESSAYS ON JEWISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE, AND KINDRED SUBJECTS

G. DEUTSCH

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/scrolls0000unse

SCROLLS

ESSAYS ON JEWISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE, AND KINDRED SUBJECTS

GOTTHARD DEUTSCH

SCROLLS

ESSAYS ON JEWISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE, AND KINDRED SUBJECTS

By

GOTTHARD DEUTSCH

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II.

התורה מגלה מגלה נתנה

The Torah was given in single scrolls.

—*Gittin*, 60, *a*.

ARK PUBLISHING COMPANY
CINCINNATI

BLOCH PUBLISHING COMPANY
NEW YORK

1917

Copyright, 1917
by
ARK PUBLISHING COMPANY

Meiner Lieben Gattin

Hermine
geb. Bacher

zur Vorfeier des dreissigsten Jahrestages
unserer Vermaehlung

10, Mai, 1918

CONTENTS.

The Year 5671 7
The Year 5672 57
The Year 5673 87
The Year 5674 141
The Year 5675 169
The Year 5676 A. M. 201
Isaac M. Wise 235
Moses Mielziner 239
Jacob H. Schiff 247
One Generation Goeth and Another Cometh. . 257
Reminiscences of the Breslau Seminary:
Leyser Lazarus 267
Freudenthal and the Breslau Seminary . . . 279
Isaac Hirsch Weiss 287
Isaac Loeb Perez 297
Shalom Alechem 307
Heinrich Heine 315
Francis Joseph 321

THE YEAR 5671*

THE SITUATION of the Jewish people was this year as for the last thirty years dominated by the Russian question. The fact is most keenly felt in lands of freedom, and above all, in the United States, which receives the bulk of the Jewish fugitives from Russian tyranny. Not only is the religious and general communal life conditioned on the rapid increase of Jewish settlements and the consequent necessity of providing work for the new arrivals, of caring for the dependents amongst them, and of trying to raise them as quickly as possible to the level of American citizenship; not only is the question of restriction of immigration a prominent Jewish question, but there is at present the only political question for Jews in the United States, that of the Russian passport. The commercial treaty concluded with Russia, in 1832, provides for the mutual freedom of residence in the territories of either of the contracting parties, and yet Russia takes the stand that she has the right to subject American Jews to the same exceptional laws, which she has found proper to impose upon her own subjects. Presidents and congresses have repeatedly pronounced this a wilful misinterpretation of the treaty, and Jews feeling indignant at the attempt to reduce them to citizens of the second class, be it at home or abroad, are justly protesting against this continued insult. No American statesman has ever dared to question the justice of the

*The American Israelite, September 14-21, 1911.

Jewish interpretation of the treaty of 1832, expressed in resolutions passed by various Jewish bodies, and particularly by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, assembled in convention at New York. President Taft could not ignore this demand and had repeated conferences with representative Jews on the subject; with Messrs Bettmann and Cutler, January 26th, with Judge Goldfogle, February 13th, and others. His attitude was that of a diplomat, whose highest aim is to get out of an embarrassing situation, rather than to enforce a just demand, which by no means is to convey the idea that Mr. Taft has any sympathy with Russian tyranny, or is indifferent to the sacred duty of this government, to secure for all its citizens equality of right, both at home and abroad. Least of all could he be unmindful of the solemn pledge made in the party platform, on the strength of which he was elected, but between upholding a theory and enforcing it, at some sacrifice in conducting public affairs, there is a considerable difference. Congress has taken this question up repeatedly, first by the motion introduced by Mr. Herbert Parsons, February 10th, and later by an interpellation introduced by Mr. Harrison of New York in the House of Representatives, May 30th, when a press dispatch had made the erroneous announcement, that Russia was willing to yield on certain important points. Furthermore any number of state legislaturers have taken up the same question, instructing their representatives in congress to insist on the adjustment of the matter. Nevertheless the matter stands as it stood years ago, when both large parties embodied

in their platforms the pledge to remove this injustice. Nor does there appear to be any remedy unless the United States take the consistent step of repealing the treaty of 1832, which they are unwilling to do probably on account of the overshadowing powers in our public life, the interests of large corporations which would find their exports to Russia imperiled, and consequently their dividends reduced. The suggestion made by President Taft to the Union of American Hebrew Congregations that an insistence of the United States on its claims would result in further persecution of the Russian Jews, sounds very much like a clever move for getting out of an embarrassing situation. On the other hand, we cannot complain of the political situation of the Jews in America. The election of four coreligionists to the House of Representatives is nothing extraordinary and perhaps proportionately far below that of the political standing of the Jews in Great Britain, and certainly far below that of the Italian Jews. The appointment of Hon. Julian Mack as judge of the newly-created court of commerce, is quite a compliment to the people to whom he belongs, and the list of those elected to prominent positions in state or in municipal bodies would be far too long for enumeration.

The reverse side must not be overlooked. The "Kansas City Journal," in its issue of May 25, 1911, says: "Evidences of antisemitism in this country appear to be cropping out with a frequency which is much deplored." The most important event in this connection is the refusal of Col. Garard to admit Sergeant Blum to examination as officer. The

reason for this refusal was given in a form which we would only expect in the German army, and perhaps even there, rather orally than in an official document. Col. Garard said that Blum as a Jew, and incidentally as the son of a tailor, did not possess that social standing which would justify his admission into the corps of army officers. This is, first of all, a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of American citizenship, and the names of Lincoln, Garfield, and Andrew Johnson would suffice to refute such an assertion. Nevertheless it must appear deplorable from a Jewish point of view that being a Jew means in the opinion of a certain class of American citizens, an inferiority, if not a political disablement. President Taft, whose attention was called to the matter by Hon. Simon Wolf, of Washington, the indefatigable champion of Jewish rights, acted with a promptness and decision that leave nothing to be desired. He showed also his determination to uphold the principles of American citizenship in an address which he made at a Washington synagog, and in which he denounced the clubs which for reasons of snobbery, would refuse to accept as members respectable and cultured Jews. This remark was meant for the Metropolitan Club, which shortly before had blackballed Hon. Jefferson M. Levy, member of the House of Representatives. It is stated with genuine grief that the destruction of the interior of the synagog of Washington, by vandals, May 22d, looks very much like a reply of the sympathizers of the Metropolitan Club to the address of Mr. Taft, made May 11th. A similar act of vandalism occurred in the synagog of Lynn, Mass.,

about the same time. Nor is the blackballing of Mr. Jefferson M. Levy, who is a descendant of an old American family, an isolated fact. About the same time Arthur Haas, a high school teacher of New York, was—one might say—expelled from the Motor Club, because he was a Jew, resenting an insult offered to his people. Prof. Haas had originally been a member of this club, and when another Jew, whose petition he indorsed, was blackballed, evidently because he was a Jew, Prof. Haas took the only logical step, and resigned from the club. He was induced to reconsider his resignation and when he made his application for readmission, he was blackballed, the only explanation for this action being that the members of the club desired to humiliate him. Still more humiliating was the experience of Mr. Leo S. Herzig, a prominent sportsman, who was turned out from the premises of the Larchmont Club, although he was entitled to visit the club as a member of an affiliated society, and also as the guest of a member of the club. To the same class of incidents belongs the experience of Isidore Roth, a student of the Northwestern University, of Ada, Ohio, who was expelled for fighting and declared that he fought his fellow students because he was constantly taunted as a Jew. We might include in this list also the statement of Mr. S. S. Thorpe, a colonization agent in Chicago, who made the remark at the meeting of the Mississippi Land Development Association, that in his large business transactions he was glad to say that he had never colonized Jews. The statement of a business house in Minneapolis, which wrote to a

salesman, that while a Jewish firm was a better customer than a competing Christian firm in the same place, they would prefer under like circumstances to do business with "white people," is in its very form of expression a discouraging symptom of views humiliating to the self-respecting Jew. It would not be right to overestimate the importance of such incidents. They are, first of all, a consequence of historic conditions dating back to remote centuries and are based on an inherent feeling in human nature, which likes to draw lines of social contact for the sake of snobbish self-gratification. It would, however, be equally wrong to ignore such conditions, or to consider them as altogether insignificant. We must, however, also record the great progress made by Jews as evidenced by the large number of new synagogs, charitable and sociological institutions by the important fact that the recent immigrants from Russia show great progress, both materially and intellectually by the institutions which they are creating, and, finally, a small incident might be quoted as highly significant. For the first time a weekly paper printed in Judaeo Spanish, was published in New York. It seems to have expired very soon but the mere attempt is highly significant. We are receiving a constantly growing number of immigrants from Turkey, and this may indicate the beginning of a large immigration from Oriental countries. American life will not permit any aloofness between elements of different historic antecedents, which is the rule in the Orient, and has even existed for centuries in London, Amsterdam, and Vienna. It may therefore

be confidently expected that the United States will prove a "melting pot" for Jews of the most widely different traditions.

Next to the United States only Canada is of any consequence for Jewish settlements on this continent. The last year has been rather unfavorable owing to the vigorous agitation in the province of Quebec, and especially in Montreal. The unfortunate enunciation of Mayor Nathan of Rome on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the new Kingdom of Italy, formed, as it seems, a welcome pretext for passing a resolution at a large open air gathering, at which the archbishop was present, which spoke in very hostile tones of the Jews. Clerical agitation to prevent Catholics from selling real estate to Jews is inspired by the desire of depriving Jewish citizens of participation in public life. Conditions in France are evidently reflected here. The numerous monks, who had to leave France on account of the law of separation, are trying to carry out the scheme, defeated in their native country, on the new soil. It would hardly seem possible that what failed in France, a Catholic country, should succeed under the British flag. It is, however, not very encouraging to learn that the Canadian government, so eagerly endeavoring to increase its population, sets its face against Jewish farming settlements, and yet to countries, sparsely populated as Canada, the Jew, driven from his home by unbearable conditions, must turn with the hope of relief. This statement might apply to Mexico, which to all appearances has great prospects for industrial and mercantile development. A notice that

went the rounds of all papers spoke of a commission appointed by the government of Mexico, which visited the Jewish colonies in Russia for the purpose of inducing Jewish colonists to settle in Mexico. The report was never officially confirmed, and would hardly seem credible. At any rate, under the present uncertain political conditions Mexico cannot be considered among the countries which promise to provide new homes for oppressed Jews. Somewhat better is the condition in Argentina. The report of the Jewish Colonization Association, which recently came to hand, came too late to be exhaustively utilized in this review. It is to be greeted with satisfaction, however, that the colonies in Argentina are making considerable progress, there being nearly 20,000 souls settled on farm land, and most of the colonists independent, some of them even prosperous. A Mr. Chasanowitsch tried to create an agitation in New York against the administration of the J. C. A., declaring that the colonists are held in slavery, and that the development of the settlement was being artificially retarded. It is impossible at such a distance to have a clear view on the merits of these charges. We must, however, accept as very weighty the testimony of the farmers themselves, who in their Yiddish organ protested against outsiders meddling with their affairs, declaring that they are amply able to take care of themselves, while at a time, when they needed assistance from outside, nobody took an interest in their affairs. There is another instance which might be cited in defense of the J. C. A. The general tendency of modern times is a movement from rural

districts to cities. A proof of it is, as the last census returns in the United States show, that the proportion of the city population has been constantly increasing. The same movement is still more marked in European countries. It therefore can not be reasonably expected that the Jews, whose history is that of town people, should evidence a movement contrary to that of the general population with agricultural precedents. Briefly, it must be said that the scheme of Baron de Hirsch to relieve the terrible condition of the Jews of Eastern Europe, by planting them on the soil is, as such, utopian. It will be possible to colonize a number, and let us hope, an ever increasing number, of Jews in rural settlements, but the large masses will continue to gravitate towards the cities, seeking commercial and industrial activities. In the latter respect it must also be recorded with satisfaction that the colonization in Argentina has resulted in a large settlement in Buenos Ayres, which undoubtedly in the course of time, will extend to other cities of Argentina and other South American countries.

The Zionist congress met a few days too early. It would have been a find for Max Nordau to present to his audience the shocking, and even on the Zionist side, unexpected news, of a popular outbreak against Jews in South Wales. A pogrom in England is something which is not known to have occurred since the days of the coronation of King Richard, in 1189. Even at the time of the strong anti-Jewish agitation against the re-admission of the Jews under Cromwell and Charles II, and when the emancipa-

tion law of 1753 was passed, and had to be repealed in the same year owing to popular agitation, life and property of the Jews remained safe. It is all well to console oneself with the thought that labor troubles will fan passions into fever heat, and that Jewish shop keepers and pawn brokers doing a questionable, or at any rate, an unpopular business, can explain mob violence, but it still remains a sad disappointment that England should witness an anti-semitic outbreak far worse than any that occurred in Germany and Austria during the thirty years of the anti-semitic movement. It shows that, as in Middle Ages, any event apt to kindle the spark of unrest in the masses, is also apt to cause serious outbreaks against the Jews. London saw such a disturbance in connection with a battle between the police and a few alien anarchists in the East End January 3, with which Jews were hardly connected at all, unless the fact that one of the outlaws had a Jewish common-law wife, should be considered important. Yet this occurrence at once started an outcry against the Jewish criminal. So powerful was this outcry that even Sir Marcus Samuel said in a public address that the Jews should cease to fight anti-alien legislation. How far this sentiment has taken root may be judged from an editorial statement of the "London Standard," January 26th, which accused the London county council of giving preference to aliens over Englishmen in assigning work. No less significant is the fact that the son of an English lord had taken steps to publish Sir Richard Burton's posthumous work, corroborating the ritual murder accusation. The Jewish Board of

Deputies brought a successful suit of injunction against the publisher on the ground that they had purchased the manuscript from the widow, but the fact that a representative Jewish body should feel itself compelled to buy off such a blackguard, and that the son of an English viscount should consider it worth his while to give these criminal libels publicity, is in itself significant enough, just as is the article written by the old champion of the anti-alien movement, Sir William Evans-Gordon, "The Stranger Within Our Gates," which was published in the February issue of the "Nineteenth Century." No less significant is a resolution passed by the Stepeney Borough council of London, January 11th, to ask the government for further restriction against the immigration of aliens, although this resolution was passed under the scare created in London by the almost melodramatic battle of the anarchists and the police. From this viewpoint the various legislative measures in Parliament must be regarded, the anti-alien, the divorce, the Sunday question, and a bill affecting Shehitah. It seems that the liberal government, which at the time of the elections which brought it into power fought the anti-alien measures, is now quite satisfied to enjoy its work, while they must not shoulder the responsibility for its enactment. Further legislation on this question does not seem imminent just now. More important is the Sunday legislation. It can not be denied that the English government here faces a genuine difficulty. The overwhelming sentiment of the English people is in favor of strict Sunday observance. The Jewish

settlements in large cities, notably in the East End of England disregard this law, and to enforce it means hardship which can only be justified on the basis of a state religion. The one attempt to compromise between these conflicting interests by creating a Jewish area is naturally opposed by the best element of the Jews, who do not wish that ghetto conditions should be legally encouraged. Another proposition to limit trade on Sunday to Jews, by requiring that a Jew who keeps his business open on Sunday, may sell to Jews only, seems utterly impracticable, and thus the matter is still pending. The same is true with regard to Shehitah, which is threatened by a new bill requiring that an animal before being killed shall be stunned. The committee which has charge of the bill seems to be willing to grant an exception in favor of the kosher meat trade, but here an internal difficulty arises, just as it does in the case of the divorce question. The Board of Deputies proposed that an exemption from the law on the killing of animals should be granted to a Shohet, licensed by the chief rabbi. This called forth a protest on the part of Dr. Gaster, chief rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese congregation, and he has the sympathy of the rabbis of the foreign element in England, who never were inclined to accept the late Dr. Adler as their spiritual head. Shortly before Dr. Adler's death such a question came up in court for trial. The Board of Shehitah had advertised that a butcher in the East End of London was not entitled to sell kosher meat. The latter, whose shop was under the supervision of a foreign rabbi, brought suit for

damages in the court. The matter was referred to a jury, and the jury failed to agree, which was at all events a serious blow at the ecclesiastical authority of the rabbi. Similar was the agitation against Dr. Adler's position in the divorce question. The foreign rabbis continued to divorce couples in the manner in which this is done in Russia, without reference to secular courts. The English and Anglicized elements are very much incensed at that practice, frequently based on mercenary motives and in any event apt to injure the most sacred family interests. It was perhaps indelicate on the part of Dr. Adler to advocate legal punishment for rabbis who continued in the former practice, but that he was right in the main point of enforcing the tradition of the English rabbinate against granting any divorce without court action, cannot possibly be doubted. Still his action created widespread indignation among the foreign element, and the result was the rabbinical conference held at Leeds, March 7-9, in which the feelings of Anglo-Jewry were shocked by a platform which taught a mediaeavlism, quite unintelligible in our era. An attempt to offset this impression was a conference of ministers, convened in London, June 12-14, at which Dr. Adler, quite a sick man at that time, participated. The settlement of the question of electing a chief rabbi will have a great deal to do with two important political questions, the divorce and the Shehitah legislation. The difficulty, however, is very great. It seems that there is no English rabbi who can measure up to these requirements, and to import a rabbi from a foreign country who can not speak

English, when his principal function is the representation of Anglo-Jewry at public gatherings, presents a very serious problem. Contrary to the complications of a political nature, the distinction conferred upon individuals in directly gratifying. Sir Rufus Isaacs was appointed Attorney General, and a rumor in the papers stated that he had excellent prospects of being made chief justice of England. Sixteen Jews, seven of them conservatives, and nine liberals, were returned to Parliament at the last elections, three Jews were created baronets, and one knighted. It is quite clear that, were it not for the large immigration from foreign countries, which increased the number of Jews within the last thirty years from 50,000 to at least 250,000 and thus gave to the un-assimilated element an overwhelming majority, the condition of the Jews of England would arouse as little interest as that of the Scandinavian countries of which nothing has been heard during the last year.

The wide chasm between the legal and the official position of the Jews on one hand, and the sentiments of the masses on the other, is very strongly emphasized in France. Under the conditions prevalent just now it is exceedingly risky to make a general statement. The trouble with Germany over Morocco and the popular unrest due to the high cost of living, may precipitate the country into a crisis, the course of which not the most experienced statesmen dare prognosticate. For the present, however, it may be chronicled with satisfaction that Lucien Klotz was appointed in two succeeding cabinets, minister of finance. This is nothing new in France. Since

Cremieux was appointed a member of the provisional government in 1848, succeeding governments have repeatedly raised Jews to such exalted position. There are quite a number of other new appointments of Jews to high positions in the various ministries, which are equal to the position of our assistant secretaries, and to administrative, judicial and military offices. A commanding general in France is not rarer than a minister. The population, however, does not seem to consider such facts with equanimity. The students of the law college of Paris started an agitation against Prof. Wahl, son-in-law of Narcisse Leven, the venerable president of the Alliance Israelite. Less important may be an address delivered by Bishop Laurans of Cahors, who said in a convention of Catholic lawyers at Valence, that our universities became rationalistic with Cousin, deistic with Jules Simon, afterwards Protestant and atheistic, and now the Jews control it, in corroboration of which statement he quoted two appointments of Jews to prominent teaching positions. It seems a humorous incident to remember that the diocesans of this bishop were in mediaeval times considered worse than the Jews. In mediaeval times, "Jews and Kawertschin" was a technical phrase for usurers. A little more significant was the attack of socialists on Rothschild in connection with that serious railroad strike, which has enriched the international dictionary with the new word "Sabotage." Of course the socialists may be entirely right in their complaints against the railroads in general and against the railroads controlled by the Rothschilds in particular, but that from such

quarters attacks should be made on the capitalists, not as capitalists but as Jews, shows that it is not clericalism alone which is willing to make use of a popular phrase, for the sake of winning over the masses. The most serious outbreak of all was that which occurred in the Comédie Francaise, on the occasion of the production of Henry Bernstein's play, "Après Moi," February 24th. The play may be good or bad, this is none of our concern. The attack, however, was not made on the play, but on the author. Shouts were heard, "À bas les Juifs," and the scandal was started by a man who rose in the audience and yelled, "This play was written by a Jewish deserter from the army." The charge as such was true, but Bernstein deserted from the army not because he is a coward, but because as a young man of 20, he was enthused with the anti-military socialist ideals, which he had imbibed from the works of Urbain Gohier, who, to prove the superiority of Aryan morals, gave out the letter written to him years ago by his youthful admirer, when the latter was to receive the unusual compliment of seeing his work produced in the classic theatre, which is made famous by the immortal name of Molière. The whole incident looks like a parallel to the Dreyfus case. The moment a Jew was appointed to the general staff, all reactionary forces combined to strike a blow at the man who entered upon such a successful career, and the same is true in the Bernstein case. The Mordecai who stands erect will always be an eye-sore to the Hamans.

We are used to look upon the southern peninsula of Europe as an ideal country, as far as the condition

of the Jews is concerned. Indeed evidences to corroborate this statement are not lacking this year, in Italy, although Premier Luzzatti has meantime resigned. The king showed his sympathy with the Jews by a visit to the synagog at Florence, and even folklore may be quoted as an illustration of the favorable opinion of the position of the Jews in Italy. It is said that the late minister of war, General Ottolenghi, who was the king's military instructor, had met the king, then crown prince, when the latter noticed that his mentor was somewhat disconcerted. Asking him for the cause, the general replied that he had "Jahrzeit"—orzai in Italian Jewish parlance—on that day and was hunting all over town to find the necessary Minyan. True or not, the story reflects the actual conditions in Italy. Nor are real facts missing to show the favorable situation. Two Jewish professors, Fano and Lustig, were appointed senators, bringing the actual number of Jewish members of the senate to twelve, and the total of all appointments since 1876, when Isaac Artom as the first Jew entered the senate, to twenty-five. Surely a favorable showing when measured by the comparatively small number of Jews in Italy, which is 34,000 in nearly forty millions. Similarly significant is the appointment of Luigi Mortara, son of the late rabbi of Mantua, as prosecutor general of the supreme court. Incidentally we heard through the retirement of Achille Coen that Italy had another Jewish general, a fact so little surprising that at the time of the appointment of Coen to this rank, the matter was not noticed at all, although the general had interested

himself in Jewish affairs, and had written a pamphlet on antisemitism. To the same category of events belongs the death of Count Humbert Ottolenghi. No other European country has raised Jewish citizens to so high a rank in the nobility. The reverse side is, however, not entirely absent. An interpellation of Signor Rosadi in the chamber, asking the minister of education, how he could justify the postponement of entrance examinations on account of the Jewish holy days, may be dictated exclusively by the policy advocating separation of state and church. Perhaps a fanatic for the prevention of cruelty to animals may be responsible for the prohibition of Shehitah in San Remo, although this is less likely, because the majority of the city council are clericals. More significant, however, is the decision of the city council of Milan not to publish the posthumous papers of the prominent publicist and statesman, Giacomo Dina, bearing on anti-semitism, because they felt that this question had better not be touched. Most significant of all, however, is the murder of a Jewish boy, Angelo Fornari, who was killed in Rome, July 6th, by a degenerate boy, who, when brought before the police judge and asked what the motive for this act was, answered: "Era un Ebreo." The inner life seems, in spite of some attempts to organize the Jewish communities into one representative body, very weak. The preparatory convention of the Jewish communities, held in Milan, February 16-17, decided to call another convention for the purpose of organization, at Rome in 1913. Highly significant is the recently recorded fact that the chief rabbi of Rome,

Vittorio Castiglioni, had ordered that his body be cremated. An orthodox paper chronicled the fact that this rabbi was considered a conservative, and had declared to a correspondent of that paper his regret at his inability to guide the congregation according to orthodox principles, and not long before his death, he participated in a discussion on the prohibition of solemnizing marriages during the closed season between Passover and Shabuoth, saying that a Minhag must be kept sacred. Nowhere has the transition from a strict orthodoxy and mystic conception of religion to complete abandonment of religious life been more marked than in Italy.

The impending agitation for separation of state and church in Spain, which also threatens the continuance of the monarchical constitution, has aroused the clericals to try their old scheme of spreading the fable of the omnipotence of the Jews. From this point of view we can understand the story first circulated by the "A B C Blatt," a well known clerical sheet of Germany, which said that in Seville a Bar Mizwah was celebrated, at which an ex-minister and various prominent municipal and provincial officials were present. The story is somewhat improbable. We never heard of any regular organization with a house of worship in Seville, and in fact not until July 1910 non-Catholic churches were given the right to erect regular edifices. It is therefore improbable that the Jews of Seville should have erected such a synagog without aid from outside and without anybody finding it worth his while to

report that for the first time in 420 years a regular synagog was opened in Spain. If, however, we accept this report as a means of arousing public opinion to the danger that the separation of state and church in Spain would lead to the conversion of the country to Judaism, and if we further take into consideration the abundance of faith found amongst the readers of clerical newspapers, the explanation is easy. As a well established fact we may record the promise of King Alphonso to the Jews of Mellila, the Spanish possession in Morocco, to grant them equality with Spanish subjects. Morocco is a different proposition, and if Spain does not wish to be counted out entirely, it will try to win over the Jews, who otherwise might be forced to take the part of France. Of no political significance is the mission entrusted to an official in the ministry, who was sent to the Orient to collect the old Spanish folk songs, still found among the Oriental Jews of Spanish descent.

Switzerland has for the first time elected a Jew to the high position of a member of the Federal Council, which is the highest governing body of the republic, consisting of seven members. The man to whom this lot has fallen is Dr. Hoffmann, a lawyer, of St. Gall.[1] The Swiss republic, as we know from American history, took 60 years ago the same stand with regard to foreign Jews which Russia is taking today. It persistently refused to recognize them as citizens, having the same rights as their fellow citizens under the treaties. Owing to the complexity of the Swiss constitution, which recognizes local autonomy to a great extent, it was not until 1878 when the Federal

[1] It was later established that Hoffmann is no Jew.

Council forced the canton of Aargau to give the Jews of the two oldest settlements in Switzerland, Endingen and Lengnau, the rights of citizenship, and with it the possibility of becoming citizens of the Swiss republic. Since that time the population has rapidly increased, and was at the last census 19,007, while in 1850 there were only 3,145 Jews, and even within the last ten years the population has increased over 50 per cent. The cause for the increase is immigration, which originally came mostly from Alsace, and now comes largely from Russia.

Very quiet have been the conditions in Holland, and the only fact worth noticing is an exception made from the Sunday law in favor of Jewish bakers. While Holland has a comparatively large Jewish population, it does not count very much in the review of Jewish events. Even as a haven of refuge Amsterdam has not in the remotest way the significance which it had for persecuted Jews in the seventeenth century.

The political condition of the Jews of Germany has for the last 33 years been dominated by the progress of anti-semitism, and the latter is now confined to the maintenance of the policy of the administration to keep Jews out of public employment and particularly out of the military career. Even the "Kreuzzeitung" frankly declared that there was no reason for maintaining the plank to fight Jewish influence in the party platform. Not that the paper changed its policy. We heard but recently that the editor, von Wagenheim, handed to a journalist in Milwaukee, who warned against fomenting ill feeling between

Germany and the United States, the handiest political argument of his party, "You are a Judenluemmel." Yet even the "Kreuzzeitung" evidently understands that the constitution of the German empire with its fundamental principle of full equality before the law for all German citizens, can not be altered, and as these gentlemen are no doctrinaires, they concentrate their efforts on maintaining the status quo. This status quo has been the subject of very lively debates in the Reichstag. The two most representative organizations of the German Jews, the Central Verein, and the Verband der Deutschen Juden, called a meeting in Berlin November 13, to protest against the exclusion of the Jews from commissions in the army, at which Councillor Cassel, member of the Prussian diet, made the statement that the Emperor condemned this flagrant breach of the constitution. The statement made by him in such a responsible position could hardly have been unauthorized, but it still remains a question why the Emperor, if he feels so, can not enforce his will in one single instance. The matter came up for discussion in the Reichstag, February 24, when the liberal member Mueller, of Meiningen, referred to the statement of the Minister of War, Von Heeringen, who had said that the Jews lack the qualities required to win the respect of the soldiers. In his reply on the following day the minister was surprisingly frank. He admitted that the exclusion of the Jews was unconstitutional; he further admitted that there is anti-semitism in the army, or else it could not be explained why not a single Jew, though it be granted that Jews as a rule

do not possess military qualities to a high degree, should have been promoted to the rank of officer since 1885, but he said that he, as head of the department, could only act on evidence. In other words, the regular procedure demands that the officers ballot on every candidate, and, while they black-ball every Jewish applicant, it could not be proven in one single instance that they black-balled him because he was a Jew. Paasche, a member of the National Liberal party, very emphatically said: "Es muesste mit dem Kuckuk zugehen," if the War Department could not make the officers accept Jews as comrades. The anti-semites naturally seized this welcome opportunity of indorsing the practice in the army as necessary for the maintenance of its traditions, and one of them, Raabe, went so far as to say that, if Jews were made officers, a mutiny would be unavoidable. Of a few other matters that came up for discussion, the most important is the question of passports for German Jews traveling in Russia. The Secretary of State declared frankly, without even attempting to express regret, as was the custom in former years, that this was entirely an internal question for Russia to settle (March 31.) The matter is far more important for Germany than it is for America, because Germany, bordering on Russia, has far more intimate trade relations, and even Jewish physicians, called to Russia for consultation, were excluded or had to suffer indignities. The German Department of State, however, is concerned with far weightier considerations, and the possibility of Russia taking revenge by supporting the hostile policy of France and England

counts far more than the strictly ethical question of protecting the rights of German citizens who happen to profess the Jewish religion. In a debate on a new court procedure, the Socialists moved an amendment that appointment to positions on the bench shall be made independent of religion and politics. In the course of this debate various speakers pointed out cases of injustice to Jews in appointments to the bench. The amendment, however, was lost, and it could hardly be different, because the constitution provides that all appointments to public office should be independent of religious affiliation. A new enforcement of this law could not possibly make the Minister of Justice act more fairly to Jewish candidates, when he has the convenient excuse ready, that in the case of such an appointment he was guided by considerations for the good of the service. The clerical member, Groeber, used the opportunity of speaking in favor of Shehitah when the section in the new penal code dealing with cruelty to animals was discussed (January 12.) It is a traditional policy of the clerical party in Germany, as elsewhere, where they are in the minority, to make a grandstand display of their religious toleration. It gave the anti-semites a welcome opportunity to deliver tirades. The Secretary of State opposed this amendment, and one must say justly, on technical grounds. It must be remembered in this connection that Saxony, which had a prohibition of Shehitah on its statute books since March 31, 1892, abolished it December 20, 1910. This order did not please some anti-semitic municipal boards, and both the municipal authorities of Leipsic

and Zittau introduced rules in the city abattoirs, the use of which is compulsory, to annoy Jewish butchers by additional fees and similar regulations apt to injure their trade. In such parts of Germany, where anti-semitism has been strong, there is no indication of its weakening. In Giessen, where, as in all of the Grand Duchy of Hesse, anti-semitism has the strongest hold on the population in spite of the efforts of the Government and even of the church authorities to suppress it, the anti-semite Werner was returned in the by-election to the Reichstag, March 21. This is in itself not a very strong indication of actual popular sentiment. The German election law does not recognize plurality, and as at the polls no candidate had obtained a majority, an election was to be held between the Socialist and the anti-semite. Undoubtedly a great number of voters who are opposed to anti-semitism considered the election of an anti-semite a lesser evil than the election of a Socialist. The difficulty of gauging the force of anti-semitism is illustrated by two trials for libeling the Jewish religion that came up before German courts. The editor of the anti-semitic "Hammer" was sentenced to ten days' imprisonment because he had said that those who profess Judaism are a gang of criminals. This was a decision rendered by a court of Leipsic, May 10. A few weeks later the "Staatsbuerger Zeitung" of Berlin reprinted the same article, and a Berlin court decided that the author of this article, having the convictions of an anti-semite, was not consciously libeling Judaism, but expressing his convictions. The sentiment of the public is equally difficult to gauge.

The Dutch Jew, Hermann Heijermans, who lives in Berlin and writes in German, wrote a play, "Die Neue Sonne," which has no bearing on Judaism at all, dealing with the problem of the department store, crowding out the small shop keeper, thus taking its cue from Zola's novel, "Au Bonheur des Dames." The play was produced in the Royal Theatre of Berlin, and, by the way, does not seem to have been a success. The fact that a Jew should have written a play that was accepted by the manager of the Royal Theatre aroused the envy of some people who vigorously denounced its management for yielding to the agitation of the Jews for the control of the universe. The humorous, or, if you will, the tragic part of it is that Heijermans is a bitter anti-semite. His play, "Ghetto," and his novel, "Diamantstadt," present the Jew in a more unfavorable light than any anti-semite could have done. In this connection Maeterlinck, a Belgian of Flemish descent and a semi-countryman of Heijermans, may be quoted. His "Mary Magdalene" in its most important features borrowed from Paul Heyes's tragedy of the same name, contains an anti-Jewish passage for which there is no justification. He makes one of his characters say "The Jew is crafty, sly and evil-minded, has all the cringing virtues and vices, but avoids frank, straightforward deeds." In other words, the Jew is a coward and an unsympathetic figure, even as criminal, when compared with others of his class. In order to fully appreciate how deeply Maeterlinck must have been impressed by his Paris environment, as shown in the Bernstein scandal, one must remember that his play

is set at the time of Christ, when the Jew surely was not a usurer or addicted to any of the mercenary crimes charged to him in the Middle Ages.

The most important political relations between the Jews and the government will naturally fall within the jurisdiction of the federal government, but some important matters, and among them the relation of the Jews as an organization to the state, are reserved by the constitution to state legislation in the German States. In consequence it is to the small states that we must look for news in this direction, inasmuch as Prussia never recognized the Jewish church as a corporation. The most important event along that line transpired in Wuertemberg, where the government found that it was impossible to apply the law regulating Jewish affairs, issued in 1828. The matter was considered so important that the king announced a bill to this effect in the speech from the throne, January 13th. The most imperative demand for a change came from the orthodox, who refuse to be taxed for the support of a congregation to whose doctrines they cannot subscribe, and who still emphatically refuse to be governed by an ecclesiastic body the members of which they consider heretical. Some of the incidents prove that this agreement borders on the ridiculous. The rabbi of Stuttgart who is a member of the governing council of Judaism (Kirchenrat) demanded that the Shohet of the orthodox community submit to an examination, conducted by him. The Shohet refused because he, like the congregation to which he ministers, does not consider a man who worships and conducts services in a

synagog where an organ is used as a person to whom obedience in religious matters is due. Similar was the case of Paul Aron, who refused to pay his assessment to the congregation, claiming that being a member of the orthodox society he could not be held to be a member of the congregation which he considers un-Jewish. There seems to be some desire for sensationalism in the matter, because Aron had once participated in the election to congregational offices, but he maintained his standpoint; the case came up before the supreme court, which decided in his favor. The decision is highly important, because it shows that even in countries where the state recognizes the Jewish church as an organized body, an individual cannot be held to belong to it although he declares himself a Jew. This decision may have further influence on the regulation of congregational affairs in Bavaria, where a law issued as early as 1813, is still the basis of organization of Jewish congregational life. In Bavaria within late years a number of complications arose from this inadequate law, but the government has not taken any step to propose new legislation. Otherwise this largest of the South German states shows nothing worth recording except the first appointment of a Jew to a position as teacher in a Gymnasium. Evidently not without a reason, this appointment was made in the old Jewish city of Fuerth, where the minister must have thought that the friction created by such a novel step, might be more readily overcome. Small as this event is, it has a weighty meaning. More than forty years ago a Jew was appointed professor in a Bavarian univers-

ity. Other appointments followed, although they were always scarce. Since 1874 Jews were appointed to the bench, and rose to high positions. Even in the army Bavaria occasionally appointed a Jew to a position in the corps of officers, and owing to a peculiar condition, we might add as climax, Jews were appointed as teachers in Realschulen (science high schools), but the Gymnasium (classic high school) was inaccessible to them. The matter came up for discussion in the diet several times, and the minister of education evidently thought he needed a Jew as a witness for the state—bluff Jew (Renommier Jude) they call it in German—in case the question should again be brought up in the diet.

The greatest distinction to Judaism as an organization has been won by the Jews of Alsace, by the passage of a new constitution, March 31st, which gives to the consistory a representative in the Upper House of the diet. This is the only case of any German state where the organized Jewish church has been so distinguished. Next in importance is the abrogation of the Shehitah prohibition in Saxony, of which mention was made in reviewing the affairs of Germany. It is of no special interest to chronicle occasional grants made for the purpose of religious instruction as was done in Mecklenburg, December 21st, or in Oldenburg, or proposed, but refused in Hamburg. More important are certain political transactions, such as an anti-semitic debate in the Duchy of Anhalt, occasioned by the stand which the one Jewish member of the House, Dr. Cohn, took on the disproportionate representation which the con-

stitution grants to the large estate owners. This stand, based on democratic principles which have nothing to do with religion, called forth as the always handy argument of privileged classes, the reply that Dr. Cohn was a Jew. Similar debates occurred occasionally in the diet of Prussia, where the Jewish member, Peltasohn, himself a judge, proved the unfairness in the appointment of Jews to judicial positions, February 3d, and where Rosenow, also a Jew, showed that the Jews were practically excluded from appointment as district physicians, February 16th. The government succeeded five years ago in pressing a law through the diet which practically excludes Jews from teaching positions in the primary schools, restricting them to positions as teachers of Jewish religion, who, if their time is not fully employed, may devote the balance to instruction in secular subjects. The city of Breslau took advantage of this opportunity and appointed four Jews as teachers at the municipal schools, and even this perfectly legal procedure created an agitation. The main difficulty in this new school law lies in the disappearance of Jewish schools, to which Jews would have the right of unrestricted appointment. The Jewish schools are rapidly disappearing. In the large cities they are not popular, so that even Breslau, with a population of more than 20,000 Jews has no Jewish school, and Berlin with its population of 120,000 or more, maintains only two schools, one for boys, and one for girls. The Jewish school teacher was thus compelled to look for appointment in the small communities in the eastern provinces, such as Posen and

West Prussia, but there, as in the extreme west of Germany, in Alsace, the Jewish population is rapidly disappearing from the small towns. Only lately it was reported that the school of Ostrowo, which was the last Jewish school in the province of Posen to have three grades, was reduced to a school of two grades, while the school of Kurnik was entirely closed and such news are reported every month, if not more frequently. Of course they are part of the general law regulating the movement of the population, but they are of more vital importance to the Jewish community. The very state of Anhalt, which once had such a prominent Jewish community as that of Dessau, and enjoys the advantage of a bequest for Jewish purposes, amounting to millions, is also constantly declining, the Jewish population of Germany remaining stationary, and concentrating in a few cities.

The elections to the Austrian Reichsrat, held in June, brought a very agreeable surprise in the defeat of the Christian socialists, who for the last sixteen years have been holding the balance of the power. Their defeat is made significant by the victory of the liberal element in Vienna, and by the defeat of the leading lights of the organization, amongst whom stands foremost the ablest champion of the party, Prince Alois Lichtenstein, whose provocation, when he said that the Jews will have to be annihilated, can be understood. Besides this negative result, the election of sixteen Jewish members is a matter of considerable importance, although they are distributed amongst various parties and quite a number of them

are socialists, who are only nominal Jews. Another damper is put on the triumph by the action of the so-called progressives, who refused to recognize the two Jewish members elected in Vienna, Kuranda and Ofner, as members, while the converted Jew, Redlich, was considered eligible. The new Reichsrat had in its first sessions, July 25-28, already an opportunity to deal with a Jewish question. At the election held in Drohobycz, Galicia, a regular carnage took place, the military shooting at a rioting crowd and killing twenty-eight people, most of them Jews. The peculiar feature of this terrible event was that the candidate elected, and opposed by the Jews, was the Jew, Dr. von Loewenstein, son of the late preacher of Lemberg, Bernard Loewenstein. Loewenstein was the candidate of the Polish party, which, controlled by a combination of the nobles and clericals, is maintaining its power in eastern Galicia, where the majority of the country population consists of Ruthenians, by an abuse of power, which is the tradition of this combination, dating from the days of the old Polish kingdom. The masses of the Jewish population have excellent reason to oppose such a candidate, who is a tool in the hands of their enemies. The outrageous frauds practiced at this election incensed the masses, but the wholesale slaughter was by no means justified, and the minister admitted this fact in the Reichsrat. What the outcome of the investigation will be, can easily be foreseen. It will result in some mild reprimand of the officer in charge of the troops, or perhaps in a declaration that the responsibility cannot be fixed. Quite serious was the situation of the numerous

Jewish inn-keepers in Galicia, who by the new excise law, are rendered destitute. In order to understand the situation, we shall have to go into history. Part of the policy of Polish nobles was the creation of monopolies, amongst which the monopoly of distilling was the most profitable, and at the same time, the most pernicious of their privileges. Every Polish noble had a monopoly in distilling and selling alcoholic beverages on his estate. This privilege he usually farmed out to Jews, a condition reported in old Jewish sources (Solomon Luria: Resp., No. 32). The Jew was merely the drudge of the noble, and this condition continued until last year, when a new excise law indemnified the nobles for the loss of their privilege, while the poor Jewish inn-keeper was rendered destitute. Thus 8,000 families are said to have lost their means of earning a livelihood, and 3,000 of them appeared in a parade in Vienna, in order to arouse sympathy and demand assistance on the part of the state. Nothing was done, but subsequent disclosures led to the exposure of incredible corruption, in distributing the licenses among politicians and their henchmen. Another economic hardship was inflicted upon the Jews of the poorest class by a new law restricting the trade of the peddlers. This matter was also discussed in the Reichsrat, February 7th, but again without tangible result. It must be regretted that some Jews waste their energies on puerile demonstrations, like the demand that Yiddish be recognized as a language. The question came before the supreme court in connection with fines imposed on Polish Jews who, at the census, December

13, 1910, registered their language as Yiddish. The decision of the supreme court, July 10, 1911, was that Yiddish was not a legally recognized language. A more important decision was rendered by the same court, November 24, 1910. When clericalism came into power, a law passed in 1883 declared that the principal of each school must belong to the same religion professed by the majority of the school children. In this way it was intended to exclude Jews from such positions, and in consequence keep them out of teaching positions entirely. In certain districts of Vienna, however, where the majority of the population is Jewish, the same law will necessitate the appointment of Jews as principals. In one instance, however, the antisemitic majority of the Vienna city council gerymandered the school districts so that the Jewish children were distributed in such a manner that they could not become a majority. The trustees of the Vienna congregation carried the matter into the courts and obtained a favorable decision. In Galicia where the Jewish problem is most acute, a commission investigating the cause of the distress prevailing among the Jews, was several times called and postponed. Finally the commission met., January 25th, and decided that the condition of the Jews was only part of a general economic crisis, which therefore requires no special action. Meantime mediaeval conditions continue to prevail. The kidnaping of girls, who are forcibly detained in convents, the baptizing of infants born in maternity hospitals, occasional excesses committed by peasants, and blood accusations, are of frequent occurence. One instance of incredible mediaevalism prevailing

in "Half Asia," as Franzos called this Austrian province, deserves to be noticed as a typical case. The Jew, Adolf Montag, was beaten with a cane by a government official without provocation. He sued in the court for assault and battery and was sentenced —not the official—to one month in prison for offering resistance to an official, because the latter had testified that he thought the Jew was going to attack him. One gratifying feature is the report that the Wunderrabbi of Czortkov, Israel Friedman, a descendant of a long line of Wunderrabbis, going back to Baer Mezdyrzecz, a disciple of Israel Besht, the founder of the sect, issued an appeal to his colleagues to hold a convention in order to discuss means for the improvement of the material condition of the Jews. This is quite an un-looked for event and may indicate progress in quarters which are to a great extent responsible for the prevailing misery, not alleviated in spite of forty years of political and civic equality. Somewhat better are the conditions in the neighboring province of Bukowina, where the elections to the diet resulted in the return of ten Jews out of 61 delegates. Unfortunately the Jews lack harmony, which would give them considerable power in a province which with its various nationalities, Poles, Roumanians, Ruthenians and Germans, gives them the balance of power. The trouble seems to be of a personal nature, due to rivalry between two leaders, Prof. Kellner and Dr. Straucher, the latter the representative of the Jews in the Reichsrat.

The other half of the dual monarchy presented fewer incidents of any consequence. The election to the House of Representatives resulted in the return

of eleven Jews, which is rather below former figures, and on various occasions the clerical party tried to create animosity against the Jews. A favorite subject for discussion was the immigration of Galician Jews, who are said to flood the country. The liberal party, at present in power, is evidently trying to wrench from its opponents this popular argument by expulsions of Jews, which, however, are explained as merely dictated by economic motives. Count Khuen-Hedervary, the present premier, and Count Stephen Tisza, his predecessor, emphatically declared on various occasions that their party will stand for recognition of the Jews as the absolute equals of others. The Jews seem to look forward to a recognition of Judaism as a church, very likely for political purposes, although there may be in this move a mere desire of ambitious politicians to have legal standing as leaders. This move is strongly opposed by the orthodox element who declare that they form a separate religious denomination and can not be represented by the liberal element. In this sense the minister, Count Zichy, made a statement, the logic of which cannot be contradicted. It is perhaps due to this opposition that the appointment of Chief Rabbi Kohn of Budapest, as member of the Upper House, repeatedly announced, has not yet materialized. In the complex constitution of Austria-Hungary, Croatia, while part of the Hungarian state enjoys a certain autonomy. The Jews of Croatia are few in numbers, and mostly recent settlers. They have, however, succeeded in electing one of their number, Ludwig Schwarz, as member of the diet. It is a

curious coincidence that at the head of the Christian socialist party, there is a Jewish convert to Christianity, Joseph Frank, who in 1880 was elected to the Croatian diet as the first Jew. He is the son-in-law of David Schwarz, the real inventor of the dirigible airship whose patent Count Zeppelin bought from his heirs.

The Talmudic statement (Berakot, 13a,) that the recent troubles make us forget the older ones, might have been coined for the conditions in Czar's empire. The main difficulties are the troubles due to the restrictions on the right of residence and educational privileges. All these disabilities form the most convenient method of raising revenue for grafters in office, who, since the revolutionary movement was stifled, are carrying on their business without any check. One instance is the discovery that in the commissary department defalcations to the extent of eight millions of roubles within five years, were brought to light. How this condition affects the Jews is again proven by a trial in Kishineff, which began May 23rd, and showed a regular grafters' organization, which obtained admission of Jewish students to universities by bribing the professors. Even the favors granted, show the terrible misery from which the Jews are suffering. By an ukase of May 10, 1903, the Czar added 101 villages to the Pale settlement, with the promise that other additions would be made from time to time. The next move was made in December of 1903, and after seven years of inactivity another eight villages were added by a decree of August 24, 1910. The utter uselessness of such

measures, unless they are devised with a desire to show the policy of the government in a favorable light, can be seen from the constant new restrictions carried out through means of rulings of the administrative authorities, and of decisions by the courts. Among the classes which possess the privilege of unrestricted residence are skilled mechanics. When this law was issued in 1859, it was done with the intention that the Jews should be turned from petty trading and supposed exploiting of the population to productive labor. Recently, however, the senate decided that a machinist, employed in mounting parts of machinery, which were imported from another locality, was not employed in such skilled labor as would entitle him to the privilege of residence outside of the Pale. The expulsions from Kiev were carried on with such fiendish cruelty, that even the Associated Press could not conceal these outrageous methods. The Duma which was supposed to introduce a representative form of government, and with it a more equitable treatment of the Jews, has not justified expectations. It passed a law which restricted the rights of the Jews in municipal elections in Poland, so that under no conditions could the city council have more than 20 per cent of Jewish members, December 1st. It passed a school bill, which declared that all teachers must be Christians, and rejected an amendment that continuation schools for Jews should be held on Saturdays, November 28th, but it adopted a resolution that Yiddish should be recognized as a language for school instruction, November 25th, which Purishkevitch declared an empty demonstration

as the government would never accept it. The greatest hardship was entailed upon the Jews by the adoption of a law, making Sunday rest compulsory, while the amendment to allow Jews and Mohammedans to work on Sundays was rejected, December 26th. The bill introduced last year for the abrogation of the Pale, was referred to the committee on personal rights, February 22nd, and thus conveniently placed in storage, as this committee will not report before the expiration of the term of the present Duma. The government, however, used an opportunity in flagrant violation of the constitution, to issue a new restriction on the rights of the Jews. During the recess of the Duma the Czar issued an order, March 24th, which declares that Jewish "externes" are subject to the same limitation of percentage in schools as are the students, attending school. Formerly Jewish students could at least prepare themselves privately for examination, and upon passing examination expect to attend universities. Now this privilege is taken from them and although Roditcheff, a liberal member of the Duma, and Friedman, the Jewish representative, attacked this order as unconstitutional, the Duma disposed of it by referring it to a committee, April 4th, which again means that nothing will be done. The same body, however, showed itself quite alert in discussing a report that the Jews formed more than one-half of the dodgers from army service, and passed a resolution to appoint a commission for investigation of this condition, adding, however, that Mohammedans, Lithuanians, and Poles should be included, April 12th. The facts are evidently these.

A great many Jews have emigrated, taking their children along. The Russian law does not recognize the legality of expatriation, and therefore boys registered in the birth records are called to army service, and are considered deserters, even if they have emigrated with their parents as infants. Undoubtedly a considerable number—and none will blame them for that—emigrated as young men, in order to avoid military service. It is certainly not an inducement to serve three years in the army, to be liable to duty in the field for nineteen more years undergoing all the hardship of Russian military service, and, as recent instances prove, to be deprived of citizenship, after having won distinction for bravery in action In spite of these conditions, which naturally would affect the proportion of Jews in the army unfavorably, it has been proven by official figures that the Jews form a larger proportion in the army than their percentage of the population would require. In Warsaw the Jewish contingent was fixed at 850, and that of the Christians at 487, although the Jewish population forms only one-third of the city population. The reactionaries in the Duma used another opportunity for attacking the Jews by bringing up for discussion the ritual murder libel of Kiev. This matter has been going through the newspapers so long, that a brief reference will suffice. Andrew Jushzinski, a boy of 11 years, was found murdered in Kiev, March 25th. It was not until fully a month later that this incident led to the spreading of the old blood libel. Unfortunately the murderer has not been discovered yet, although for a time it appeared that the step-

father of the boy was the perpetrator of the crime. The reactionaries used this opportunity for inflammatory speeches in the Duma, but the minister of justice replied coolly that it could not be discussed in as much as the case was under investigation in the courts. One would, however, be mistaken if the attitude in this case were to be taken as an indication of the general attitude of the government toward the Jews. Aside from the constant annoyance of the Jews by all sorts of regulations in the laws affecting residence and education, the government showed its colors by an order that every conversion of a Jew to Christianity was subject to the consent of the minister, and that any sect, accepting a Jew as conver t without the consent of the minister, is committing a felony. Such a policy would naturally encourage every ambitious official to display his patriotism, the most typical case being that of a principal of a secondary school in Kiev, who proposed the question to the superintendent, whether Jewish students are entitled to take books out of the library. It seems to be the government's policy to restrict all movements toward intellectual progress. Thus the Jewish Literary Society founded in 1908, was suspended on the ground that it engaged in politics. The forces that always stood for reaction are heartily endorsing the government's policy, as was done by a congress of the nobility, which convened in St. Petersburg, February 28, and which passed resolutions requesting that the government discharge all Jews from state service. The Czar sent a telegram appreciative of the work of the convention, and as highly illustrative of

the conditions explaining such a policy, it ought to be mentioned that at the same time Col. Polyakoff was sentenced to five years in the penitentiary for embezzlement in the commissary department of Moscow, of which he was the head. Any child can see that the members of this class can not desire to have outsiders examine into their conception of patriotism.

Queen Elizabeth, of Rumania, the crowned poetess, had granted an interview to the Austrian Jewish journalist, Sigmund Muenz, April 22, 1910, in which she spoke, among other matters, of her high regard for the great philologist, Jacob Bernays, who used to visit at the castle of her parents in Neuwied, while he was professor at Bonn. She spoke so highly of his fidelity to Judaism, that the statement must have been dictated by the desire to bring it to public notice. It is still more remarkable that this interview was not published until April 9, 1911. What was the reason for its publication at that moment? One would imagine that the government wished to become agreeable to the Jews in foreign countries. Is it because the financiers are to be kept in good humor according to the fiction that Jewish financiers might refuse a favorable business proposition because of their Jewish sentiments, or is it because Rumania plans some new restrictions on the Jews, and these in response to a popular demand? The political events are of conflicting nature, but generally rather unfavorable. The supreme court reversed the sentence of a lower court, which fined the rabbis of Jassy for refusing to assist at the ceremony of an oath

more judaico, November 25th. A court of Jassy refused to admit a Jewish bankrupt to bail, which is the law in such case, under the claim that every Jew is a vagrant. The minister of education ordered that teachers of Hebrew must pass an examination in the Rumanian language. As the government restricts in every way possible the admission of Jews to public schools, the object can only be to embarrass the Jewish schools. The minister of commerce ruled that all engaged in the express business, must be Rumanian citizens, or in other words that Jews are excluded from such occupations. In the last campaign, the conservative party, trying to get into power, published a cartoon, presenting the liberals and the democrats as perpetrating a ritual murder, of which Rumania is the victim. Popular feeling was manifest in a demonstration at the theatre in Jassy, which prevented Francisca Rozean from appearing on the stage, because a Jewess on the stage of a national theatre was an insult to the feelings of the Rumanian people, January 21. The main problem to declare the status of Rumanian Jews who are citizens of no country, but subject to all the duties of Rumanian citizenship, has not in the slightest way been brought nearer a satisfactory solution.

The small Balkan states present nothing of any consequence except the election of Hayim Farchi, as member of the Bulgarian Parliament, which is the first case on record. Both king and queen try to show their sympathy with the Jewish people, the queen sending a donation to a Jewish fair, and the king distinguishing the chief rabbi by courteous

remarks addressed to him at a public reception. The small number of Jews living in Greece gives hardly any opportunity for including their status in a historic review. It is with the present condition of the Jews in Greece, as it is with their past history. Occasionally an old inscription is brought to light, showing a date of the 13th century without any definite information. Thus the king of Greece used the opportunity of a visit to Corfu to say a few kind words to a Jewish deputation, which, however, is no safeguard against a repetition of the outrages of 1891. Far more important is the situation in Turkey under the new development created by the constitution, and for the sake of convenience Palestine will be included. We have always been led to believe that the Turk knows of no antisemitism. This seemed to be historically established by the fact that the Jews found a haven of refuge in Turkey when they were expelled from Spain or persecuted in Italy. Of all the non-Mohammedan and non-Turkish groups in the Ottoman empire, the Jews are undoubtedly the most loyal element. They will not conspire with a foreign country as do the Bulgarians and Greeks, nor revolt against the central authority as do the Albanians. It seems, however, that we were optimists in this respect. Occasional reports of boycotts of Jewish merchants, of the display of invidious posters, and even of a combination of Greeks and Turks, as happened in Demotica, where a petition was presented to transfer the cattle market from Tuesday to Saturday, seem to indicate that the Jew is not considered an ally of the Turk. Far more serious are the attacks by the native population of Arabia and Mesopotamia

on the Jews, which were reported in June. These attacks resulted in the destruction of property, fortunately without loss of life, but they are an indication of insecurity and hostile feeling. Even the progressive element of the Young Turks are not as sympathetic to the Jews as was expected. Riza Tewfik Bey demanded in the Parliament, November 28th, measures against the immigration of foreign Jews, similar to those of England and the United States. This statesman expressed himself in the same way in an interview in England, when he attended the Universal Races Congress. His reason for such a demand, was, as clearly stated, the Zionist agitation, which, movement came up several times for discussion in the Parliament. The premier and the grand vizier, declared that Zionism was a utopia, March 31st. The latter went even farther in an interview with chief rabbi Nahum, in which he spoke of the Zionists as a handful of charlatans. At the same time it is noteworthy that the agitation against the Jews was carried on by Arabic members from Mesopotamia May 16th, while the Bulgarians and Greeks, as well as the Armenians took the part of the Jews. This is so much the more noteworthy as shortly afterwards, the London "Times" gave publicity to reports of wild attacks on the Jews by its Vienna and Constantinople correspondents, as being responsible for the recent massacre of the Albanians and of the Armenian massacre of 1860. While thus the Jews are supposed to aid the Mohammedans in the oppression of the Christians, they are themselves subject to continuous attacks of the Arabic population in Palestine. Every once in a while we hear of attacks

by Arabs on Jewish colonists in Palestine, and on such occasion the Greek Catholic population is reported as assisting the Arabs. The grand vizier promised the chief rabbi protection for the colonists, but the security of life and property is by no means improved. It is true that the Bedouin considers highway robbery regardless of the victim's nationality or creed a legitimate occupation, but these events certainly do not corroborate the optimistic conception, still held in Zionist camps, that the Arab looks upon the Jew as a sort of cousin. A calm observer must feel that for the present all that can be expected of Turkey, is that she shall accord her native Jews fair treatment.

Persia is in the midst of a crisis and it is therefore no wonder that we were treated to the usual horrors. Thus the Jews of Shiraz were attacked under the pretext that they had defiled a Koran and had killed a Persian girl, October 30th. In the course of this attack 12 Jews were killed and 50 wounded. It sounds rather peculiar that the tutor of the child shah should have sent a letter to a Russian rabbi asking him to send him a juvenile monthly, which he is editing, because the shah is to be educated in the broad principles of humanity. As this tutor is a Russian, we cannot help forming our own ideas about these humanitarian principles. Persia and Morocco have always been on the same level, preserving to us a specimen of the treatment of the Jews in medieaval times. The present crisis in Morocco naturally resulted in a number of serious outbreaks. Attacks on the Jews of Debbu, January 22nd, resulted in loss of life and property. Far more serious was the con-

dition of the Jews of Mekinez during a fight between two Berber tribes at the gate of the Mellah, April 16-18. It was an entirely novel experience that the Jews defended the Mellah successfully, keeping the besiegers out with the comparatively slight loss of one killed and three wounded. A terrible experience was that of the Jews of Fez, during the Passover holydays, when the Berber tribes besieged the city until French troops arrived to bring relief, April 24th. We may, however, look into the future with some confidence, because the friction between Germany and France is bound to be removed, and whatever the outcome may be it is expected that the centuries of unspeakable misery for the Jews of Morocco will give way to a condition similar to that of Algeria and Tunis. In the latter country the appointment of Elijah Fitussi as member of the council of the government, and the bestowal upon him of the legion of honor makes up amply for an attack of native soldiers on the Jewish quarter, when they were drafted for service in Morocco. At least after the experience in South Wales one ought not to take an attack of the Jews in time of trouble too seriously. Similar instances are reported from Tripoli, for which the time for European intervention does not seem to have arrived, unless Italy should be waiting for her opportunity when the troubles in Morocco are settled. Very quiet were conditions in Egypt, where the only fact to be recorded is the raising of two members of the illustrious Cattaui family to the rank of pasha. Passing from this country of the oldest civilization on the dark continent to that of the most recent, we record the appointment of Samuel Marks as senator

in South Africa, but also the introduction of a new immigration bill which places arbitrary power in the hands of the immigration inspectors, and is therefore strongly opposed by the Jews. It is to those lands of growing opportunities that the Jew must look for the final solution of the old question.

Liberalism seemed during the last few years to be in the ascendency. It would appear that the indifference to religious questions, created by the all-absorbing endeavors to combat antisemitism in its various forms, is giving way to a conviction that something must be done in order to adapt Judaism to the changed condition of the epoch. It is too early to prognosticate the future of the reform movement in England, and it would also seem that such small concessions as the introduction of late Friday evening services in Berlin and other German cities are not significant enough to warrant a conclusion. Far more significant is the fight between the two factions of the Zionists, which became acute in the school management in Palestine. The regular organization established a high school in Jaffa, based on modern pedagogic principles, for instance, introducing the co-educational system. This in itself is considered a provocation to Jewish sentiment. The present writer remembers that a boy of six, who had just entered the first grade of a Jewish school, refused to sit in a seat occupied by a girl, when the girls were dismissed, the boys remaining for instruction in Pentateuch. This was an exceptional case in western Europe, but in the Orient such a sentiment is far more general and natural. In addition to these revolutionary methods, provocation came through the introduction

of higher criticism in the teaching of the Bible. On this point a compromise seems hardly possible, for either the contradiction between the first and second chapter of Genesis must be explained away by the old apologetic artifices, or they have to be frankly admitted. The orthodox faction established a high school of its own conducted on orthodox principles, but not satisfied with this they demanded that the Zionists as an organization should at least exclude all controversial views from the public schools maintained by them. Further friction arises from the attitude of the advanced elements, particularly the socialists among the Palestinian colonists. The latter seem to have brought to Palestine that spirit of opposition to traditional Judaism, which we can notice in the Russian Haskalah literature of fifty years ago, as in the works of Abraham Mappu and Leon Gordon. In Europe the question seems to be less actual, perhaps because the desire to maintain the organization makes the liberals yield to the conservatives. Therefore it seems that in the two extremes, America and the Orient, the battle will be most determined. Only part of this struggle was evidenced by the attacks on the Alliance Israelite Universelle. It is really grievous to notice that an organization, which was the first to combine the Jews all over the world and which has done yeoman's service in bringing culture to the Jews of the Orient, should in such manner be embarrassed in its activity. This does not mean that the work of the Alliance is in every detail perfect. It is quite possible that it can stand a great deal of improvement. It is even highly probable that the custom of electing into the management men who are

often merely nominally connected with Judaism, and for instance the preparation of teachers in a normal school at Paris, where Jewish sentiment is not the strongest, are grievous faults, but the attack on Solomon Reinach for having expressed radical views in a scientific work, which has nothing to do with his participation in the work of the Alliance, seemed inspired by bitter partisan motives. Least of all should the Zionists have joined in it, for in acclaiming Nordau and recognizing him as their leader, they are doing the same thing for which they blame the Alliance. More regrettable is the attitude of the German branch of the society, which seemed to be inspired by a motive, which is out of place in this connection. The Jews of all countries still require united action for the safeguarding of their most elementary rights and for the sake of bringing relief to their brethren in lands of oppression. Anti-semitism has not made any notable progress within the last year, but we cannot say that an admission like that of the "Kreuzzeitung," that the anti-semitic plank should be dropped from the party platform, or the defeat of the clericals in the Austrian elections or achievements in public life by individual Jews in various countries, are in any way symptoms of the realization of the ideal that the Jew in the eyes of the outside world is merely a human being whose vices, as well as virtues, should be considered as that of an individual. Our Rosh Hashanah prayer, that the whole human family may form one bond of brotherhood, is still a distant ideal.

THE YEAR 5672*

THE church Father Augustine says somewhere: "Quamvis nondum venerit gaudii nostri plenitudo, nec tamen sine gaudio relicti sumus." It seems somewhat singular to begin a review of the Jewish year with a quotation from a Church Father, especially as the Talmud [1]says something similar in the statement that we neither enjoy the prosperity of the wicked nor do we suffer the affliction of the righteous. The quotation, however, is not chosen without a purpose, for it leads to the subject with which we unfortunately have to begin our review.

It is certainly not pleasant to know oneself to be the target of attack on all sides—from infidels, from rationalists, from narrow-minded religionists, from latitudinarians, for materialism, for crowding the professions, for obtrusiveness, as well as for clannishness. Such unfortunately, however, is our lot. Sometimes our enemies awaken within us rather compassion than bitterness. A peculiar specimen is Mr. Hilaire Belloc, former member of the British Parliament and decidedly a clever writer. His pet aversions are Cesare Lombroso and Max Nordau. Both to him are charlatans. They are in literature and science what the vender of fake jewelry is in business, and in addition, they belong to a clique which forces itself on the public, exacting admiration, just as the seller of cheap jewelry coaxes you into

*The American Israelite, September 21, 1912.

[1] Abot, IV, 15.

buying. It is something of the humor of history that these scurrilous charges are given publicity in the New York Times, (Aug. 4). The main objection which Mr. Belloc has against Lombroso is that the doctrine of criminal predisposition is anti-Christian. This leads us back to St. Augustine, the real father of the dogma of predestination, which, after all, is the theological presentation of Lombroso's medico psychological theory.

In lands of freedom anti-Semitism is mostly restricted to an occasional outbreak of mob rudeness, or to a more refined literary expression and is usually confined to the man with the grievance. It is hardly worth while to chronicle that a mob attacked Jews at Maldon, Mass., on the second day of Rosh Hashanah, while they performed the Tashlik ceremony. Devotional exercises in the open air are always somewhat provoking to outsiders. A little more serious is the attitude of "Life," the self-styled comic paper, which makes a practice of attacking the Jews and in its issue of February 1, proposed to retaliate against Russia's discrimination by refusing Russian Jews to enter America. The social side of American anti-Semitism was represented this year when the Brookhaven Country Club of Atlanta, Ga., was put into the hands of a receiver, with no other reason but for the sake of getting rid of the Jewish members. It is of less significance when a Polish Catholic paper of Winnipeg, Canada, declared war against the Jews, the alleged cause of the downfall of Poland, and ended up with the battle cry "Down with the Liberal Jewish Government." This Liberal Jewish Government

was, to our knowledge, headed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, a conforming Roman Catholic. While it is not very surprising to find such a view expressed in a Polish Catholic paper, which in all likelihood is managed by Jesuits, who surely need a scapegoat for the downfall of Poland, which was their own work, we are somewhat surprised to read in a periodical of the standing of the "National Review," that "the international, cosmopolitan Jew is a supporter of Germany against England." Anyone who is not blinded by bias, would have to confess that if there exists an international understanding in Jewry on political questions, it would be more inclined towards England than towards Germany. Still more disappointing is the attitude of a prominent ethical culturist like Stanton Coit, who charges the Jews with racial conceit. It has been our lot to be held responsible for every national or economic crisis. It is therefore no wonder that even in Italy a senator attacked Mayor Nathan of Rome, as a foreigner, and that in connection with the war in Tripoli which did not proceed as gloriously as had been anticipated, the Jews came in for their share of the blame, as shall be referred to more explicitly later on. Surely nobody need wonder that the colossal gains of socialism in the last elections to the Reichstag pitched the Feudal and the Protestant clerical parties into frenzy. Count Mirbach who at one time condescended to "schnorr" contributions for new churches from rich Jewish bankers, predicts a revival of anti-Semitism. It is quite natural, also that Hauss, a clerical member of the Reichstag from Alsace, voicing a sentiment very likely widespread in his party,

denounces the Democrats as partisans of Jewish usurers. The clerical party saw for the first time serious gains made by the Socialist party at its expense, and—"The Jews done it!" Nor do we wonder when we read of such eccentricities as of the formation of a society against the conceit of the Jews, or of another one, to which only those are eligible who can make affidavit that there is no Jewish blood in their veins, or the publication of a pamphlet, entitled "If I Were the Kaiser," which demands the placing of the Jews on the status which they held previous to the French Revolution. In the Alpine provinces of Austria, as well as in Hungary, where clericalism reigns supreme, conditions are still worse. A clerical paper of Tyrol, demanding the exclusion of the Jews from Tyrolese summer resorts, says that it should be the duty of every one to inform the authorities when the Jew-pest appears on his premises, just as he is bound to report hog-cholera. The height of barbarity was attained in Miskolcz, Hungary, where the population started a great demonstration in honor of a common assassin, who was executed for having killed a whole Jewish family for the purpose of robbery. The sadness of such a review is intensified when we read that even the Palestinian Arabs have already produced anti-Semitic agitators, who appeal to the fellahs to drive the Jews out of the country.

In the history of 5672, the United States will undoubtedly occupy the most prominent place. This year saw the settling of the passport controversy with Russia, which has lasted for fully thirty years.

It is perhaps for the first time in history that the Jewish question entered decisively into the international relations between two great powers. Politicians were, as is always the case, in favor of temporizing. Theodore Roosevelt, in an editorial article published in the "Outlook" of October 12, 1911, suggested the submission of the whole question to the International Tribunal at the Hague. Public sentiment however, was not satisfied with such a solution. The clerical conference, composed of ministers of all Protestant denominations, passed a resolution, October 30, protesting against all discriminations between American citizens in foreign countries, on the ground of religious belief. It was followed by the formation of a National Citizens' Committee, composed of the most prominent citizens of the United States. President Taft received various prominent Jewish citizens, amongst them Julius Rosenwald, Col. Ullman, Harry Cutler, Judge Mack, November 16, and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, November 24, with the evident desire of gaining time. Undoubtedly Mr. Jacob H. Schiff's public declaration that John Hays Hammond had promised the Russian government to see to it that the treaty should not be abrogated, if his company were to obtain certain grants in Russia, had a great deal to do with the final decision. The public gathering held in Carnegie Hall, New York, December 6, which was presided over by Andrew D. White, was followed a week later by the introduction of a resolution into the House of Representatives by William Sulzer, December 13, which declared that Russia had violated the treaty. President Taft,

wishing to avoid an open rupture of diplomatic relations, notified the Russian government that in his opinion the treaty was obsolete and required alterations, December 15. It is not surprising that Shmakoff, a leader of the Genuine Russian Patriots, declared that the abrogation of the treaty was due to the agitation of Kamaiky, editor of the "Juedisches Tageblatt," and of the "Jew Shulzer of Vitepsk." It was just as natural that our friend, the "Ohio Waisenfreund," of December 27, was very much concerned at the undue influence exercised by the Jews, reprinting at the same time the old canard of an address, made by a supposed rabbi Readcliffe, who appealed to the Jews to gain dominion over the universe. —This supposed address of the rabbi with the remarkable name comes from a sensational novel, written about sixty years ago by one Hermann Goedsche, a discharged post office clerk, who wrote under the pseudonym of Sir John Retcliff—The sentiment of the country was overwhelmingly in favor of the action, as is proven by the indorsement which it received from both the Republican and the Democratic National Conventions, June 22 and July 2. Unfortunately the latest revelations from the New York underworld will not contribute towards inproving the estimation of the Jews in the public eye. Of other political events, the clamor for further restriction of immigration must not be passed unnoticed, although the bill requiring an educational test for immigrants, passed by the Senate April 19, did not become law. A very grievous wrong was done to the Jews of Canada by the pasing of a bill which placed Queen's

College of Kingston, Ont., under State control, at the same time declaring it non-denominationally Christian. The object was to obtain for it the benefits of the Carnegie fund, a procedure which must be called plainly dishonest. The legislation making a denominational college a state's institution seriously prejudices the rights of the Jews. Against this it is hardly of any consequence that Abraham Blumenthal was elected a member of the city council of Montreal, February 1, in spite of the strong French clerical agitation.

For years the question of the appointment of Jews to positions as army officers has occupied the attention of the Reichstag. On a previous occasion the secretary of War was frank enough to declare that prejudice was responsible for the total absence of Jews from the corps of officers of the German army. This year Herr von Herringen changed his tactics to the former method declaring that there was no religious prejudice in the army and if not a single Jew had been admitted to examination for the rank of lieutenant in the reserve, it was due to the lack of qualified candidates. In one particular case of a young man from Alsace whose ability had been proven by his record, the minister declared that his family connections made him ineligible. The poor young fellow had the misfortune of having a father, who kept a hardware store, in which the young man occasionally had been seen to wait on customers, and in addition he was afflicted with an aunt who in former years was in the commission business, and now, to cap the climax, conducted an institute for the cure of stutterers. It

was evident that it could not be expected of German army officers to associate with a man coming from such a family. The "Deutscher Wehrverein," in which retired army officers play a prominent part, indorsed the Secretary of War, and it is fairly certain that the Kaiser sympathizes with them, for else the principles would have long ago been broken. Yet the anti-Semites are not at all friendly disposed towards His Majesty. William II continues to be on calling terms with prominent Jewish financiers, and not long ago received Paul Schottlaender in private audience, thanking him in the name of science for the donation of a submarine boat equipped for deep sea exploration, May 20. The provocation of the antisemites was voiced by the "Deutsch-Sociale Blaetter," which declared that the Kaiser had lost all spiritual contract with his people. Another case of discrimination, which also was repeatedly discussed in parliamentary bodies, was the refusal of the hospital of Britz, an institution subsidized from public funds, to accept a Jew as interne. Upon an interpellation in the Reichstag, the representative of the government declared the action of the hospital to be legally unassailable.

The relation of the German Jews as a Church to the State falls within the jurisdiction of the various states. It is the smaller states which, as a rule, take more interest in the internal condition of the Jews. This year, however, the Prussian Diet had to deal with such a question. The congregation of Berlin, whose administration is based on an antiquated law, issued in 1847, desired to increase the number of its trustees.

for which legal enactment was necessary. With a blind obstinacy which did not at all shed lustre on the political foresight of the Jews, the orthodox protested against the bill, with the effect that it was referred back to the government, May 14th. The narrow view which always characterized the government of Saxony was manifest in an order of the Minister, May 1, who refused to excuse Jewish girls from doing needle work in the school on the Sabbath. In the little state of Saxe-Weimar, where the government of as early 1823 began assimilating the Jews, issuing an order that the services be conducted in German, and permitting intermarriages between Jews and Christians, much to the chagrin of his excellency, Herr von Goethe, who saw in this law a peril to all principles of morality, on which he was a well-known expert, the official organ of the government made a practice of attacking the Jews editorially. The matter was brought up for discussion in the Diet, and the government promised remedy. Wuertemberg has succeeded in framing a law on the organization of the congregations which takes the place of the obsolete law of 1828, and was demanded by the orthodox, who had just grievances against the petty tyranny of the Oberkirchenrat. The new law which was promulgated July 8, and is to go into effect October 1, still preserves the main features of the old constitution. Bavaria, however, is still facing the difficult problem of how to maintain on one hand the state supervision of Jewish congregational life, which the government would not miss as a matter of principle, and at the same time alleviate the grievances

of the orthodox in the large cities, who declare that the present system which recognizes only one congregation in each city, interferes with their freedom of conscience. The Premier, Baron von Hertling, a decided clerical, who in his inaugural address said that the State had Christianity as its foundation, but when taken to task, juggled his words so as to harmonize them with the constitutional rights of all citizens, March 22, made a direct promise that the revision of the law of 1813, which is still valid in matters not pertaining to the political rights of the Jews, will soon be taken up by his cabinet. The most ardent advocates of the status quo are the rabbis, the orthodox included, who are afraid that the new regulation might deprive them of the power which the law of 1813 granted them They had an opportunity recently of obtaining an indorsement of their view from the Minister of the Interior. The congregation of Kitzingen had advertised for a rabbi to be elected for a term of six months. The Bavarian rabbinical association protested against this advertisement as illegal, because, according to the existing law, the rabbi must be elected for life. The Minister ruled in their favor, December 6. Similarly he declared that the provincial authorities must not appoint a teacher of Jewish religion unless the local rabbi endorses him, November 21. As a specimen of the pettiness in some of the German states, the little principality of Birkenfeld may be cited, where the annual subsidy granted to the Jewish schools was raised from 1600 to 2230 marks. Even 8150 go some way with a constantly dwindling congregation in a small town, which cannot afford to

pay a minister, if the state does not recognize him as a public teacher, and Birkenfeld, being a Catholic country, wishes to maintain the Catholic character of its public schools. A real achievement, the only one of its kind, is to be chronicled from Alsace-Lorrain, where in accordance with the new law, Rabbi A. Ury, of Strassburg, entered the First Chamber of the diet as official representative of the Jewish communities. He owes this distinction to the good fortune that Alsace-Lorraine was annexed to Germany and the French constitution of 1808, abolished in France, by the law of Separation of 1905, is still in effect in Alsace.

The death of Karl Lueger, the antisemitic mayor of Vienna, deprived the Christian socialist party of Austria of its powerful leader. The optimistic expectation on the part of the Jews, based on the inability of the anti-semitic party to replace the dead leader and on the disclosure of corruption in its midst, have not been realized. The municipal elections of Vienna leave the clerical anti-Semitic party in power. It suffered a loss of four votes but this means rather a gain than a decline inasmuch as the combined forces of its opponents in the time of such critical development could not do it more harm. Compared with this all individual facts dwindle into significance. Straucher, a Jewish member of the Reichsrat, interpellated the government on the frequent and arbitrary expulsions of Galician Jews from Hungary. The interpellation remained an empty demonstration, as in Galicia itself the Jews are practically outlawed. In a court trial at Sanok the Judge lectured a peasant who was the plaintiff, for having trusted a Jew who

was the defendant. A protest to the Minister of Justice resulted merely in the transfer of the judge. In Hungary the Jews, as far as they take part in politics, are chauvinistic Magyars. One of them, Paul Kovacs, originally Strasser, went so far in his chauvinism as to attempt the life of Count Tisza whom the ultras considered a traitor to the national cause. In spite of that they do not succeed in gaining the confidence of Magyar Chauvinists. Polonyi denounced the Jews in Parliament as unpatriotic. Nemesis played a trick on him by the evidence produced in the house that his wife was a Jewess. The highest ambition of the Jews, encouraged by the government is to form a national organization comprising all Jews. This scheme, which is a revival of a project begun in 1868, which failed at that time, originated with Dr. Klein of Szabadka, who expected to win the orthodox over. He succeeded with a few, but the majority remained obstinately opposed to any co-operation with the "Neologues," as they call them, who, they say, have no claim to "Juedischkeit." The Minister of Justice quite consistently declared to a Jewish committee that the scheme of uniting all Jews could never be recognized by the government as long as the Jews are not united among themselves.

There is a sharp contrast between the situation of the Anglo-Jewish community as a body and that of its individual members. In the first respect we must say that the condition of the Jews has deteriorated. It reminds one of Russia, to hear that the Board of Guardians of Bethnal Green refused to award a milk contract to a Jewish firm, although it was the lowest

responsible bidder. The action was reversed a week later, September 19, and the best characterization of the procedure was the admission on the part of the members of the Board that it was a hot night, when the action was taken. Sentiments that cannot be openly admitted are easily discernible beneath the disguise of a general economic policy. The Stepney Borough council passed a resolution on immigration in view of the conditions in Russia and of the irritation existing in England, October 4. In plain prose it means "We want no more Jews." The government certainly takes cognizance of the existing sentiment, for the Home Secretary refused to hold out any promise to the Jewish Board of Deputies who asked him to reduce the naturalization fee and to make certain concessions in the educational test for immigrants, December 29. Somewhat more encouraging was the attitude of the House of Commons which passed an amendment to the National Insurance Bill in favor of alien laborers, November 2. This amendment was passed largely for the benefit of Jewish Mutual Aid Societies. The "Times," which a year ago surprised the world by its anti-Semitic attitude, publishing charges against the Jews of Turkey as responsible for the massacre of Christians, reproduced an article from a Russian paper on the occasion of the visit of Members of Parliament to Russia, which said that the Jews throughout the world endeavored to break up the Anglo-Russian agreement in order to isolate Russia politically, January 25. The paper made up for it to a certain degree by allowing space for the publication of a letter,

signed by Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, President of the Anglo-Jewish Association, and Mr. David L. Alexander, President of the Board of Deputies, who demanded the abrogation of the treaty between England and Russia on the same ground which actuated the abrogation of the treaty between Russia and America. February 29. The matter was brought up officially also in the House of Commons, but Secretary of State Grey replied quite coldly that the existing treaty gives Russia the right to act as she does and that there is little hope to obtain a concession on that point, June 11. Quite in strong contrast with these facts are the distinctions bestowed upon individual Jews, the most prominent of which is the appointment of Sir Rufus Isaacs, the Attorney General, as member of the cabinet, which is said to be the first case of an attorney general having a seat in the cabinet. This appointment brings two Jews into the cabinet, which certainly did not occur very often in the whole history of the world. The bestowal of the baronetcy upon Jacob David Sassoon of Bombay, is nothing extraordinary. The rich Jew, in spite of Lessing, was always considered the better Jew, by those who measure merits in dollars and cents. It deserves, however, particular attention, that amongst the many Jews who received distinction from the crown, are two scholars, Prof. Charles Waldstein, formerly of Cambridge, and Mark Aurel Stein, the archeologist in the Indian service, who were knighted. Both are of foreign birth, Waldstein an American, and Stein a Hungarian.

Since the final disposal of the Dreyfus case, France has not furnished anything of interest in Jewish

affairs. The only thing which deserves mention is the reappointment of Lucien Klotz as Minister of Finance in the new cabinet. Contrary to all expectations, however, Portugal, with its three hundred Jews, occupies a prominent place in the Jewish history of last year. M. Terlo, a Jew of Lisbon, memorialized the Chamber with the view of colonizing Jews in West Africa, February 6. This led to an action on the part of the Jewish Territorial Organization, which obtained from the Chamber of Deputies a valuable expression of sympathy, June 16. The main question is, however, whether the Portuguese possessions in Africa are suitable for Jewish colonization. A commission is investigating the country, but competent authorities have little faith in the feasibility of the scheme. Similarly Spain is in many ways coquetting with the Jews. Various prominent publicists are making propaganda for a repatriation of the Spanish Jews, and the Spanish consul at Tetuan, of course in the interests of the Spanish plans in Morrocco, proposed a Hispano-Jewish association. In economic questions, however, sentiment does not play a very strong part. While these Latin countries, which once were so hostile to the Jewish people are trying to make themselves agreeable, conditions in Italy present just the opposite picture. Two Roman papers attacked the Jews as responsible for spreading reports of atrocities committed by Italian troops in Tripoli. The Rabbi Readcliffe hoax is published by "L'Italie," in Rome. The "Vossische Zeitung" of Berlin contains a hitherto uncontradicted report, that the Italian ambassador in Vienna had requested the

president of the Jewish congregation to use his influence over the liberal press to prevent it from criticizing the method of Italian warfare. On the other hand, several thousand Jews were expelled from Turkey as Italian subjects. They are in reality Turkish Jews, who merely lived under Italian protection, and are now martyrs of the Italian cause. In Tripoli the Italian government seems to have found sympathy among the Jews, whose rabbinical tribunal, the new administration maintains, March 10.

Individual Jews have fared well in Turkey during the past year. The same four Jews who were members of the first parliament have been re-elected, and the first Jew was appointed as officer in the army. There is, however, a decided growth of anti-Semitism noticeable. The patriotic acts of the Jews are declared by the Young Turkish press as mere sham, behind which there is a deep-seated hatred against the Turks. Thus, in London, the Jews are denounced as philo-Turks, while in Turkey they are considered enemies of Islam. The attitude of the Arabic population of the Turkish Empire is still more hostile. In Yemen the condition is so critical, owing to the hostility of a fanatic priest, that the Jews are leaving in masses for Palestine. There the economic progress is still retarded by inefficient government, by a backward population, and naturally also by the state of war. In Greece it seemed as though the condition of the Jews would improve. An individual fact, like the discharge of a Jewish girl from the position of school teacher upon the demand of the metropolitan, would not count for much; but it is significant that an

Athens paper preaches boycott against the Jews, as sympathizers of Turkey. In Bulgaria, just as in Greece, the dynasty ostentatiously favors the Jews. When the crown prince became of age, representatives of the Jewish congregations were officially received in Court. Four Jews were elected members of the city council of Sofia, but the country population remains hostile, and again it is rather suggestive, that the papers spread the report that the Jews of Salonica aided the Turks in acts of cruelty against the Bulgarians. Unfortunately the Jewish community is very much divided, not merely in two historic sections of Ashkenazim and Sefardim but within the latter group, Zionists and assimilationists fight each other bitterly. Equally unsatisfactory is the condition in Rumania. There the King received a committee of Jews, who demanded an improvement of their condition. But it is well known that the old gentlemen is a mere figurehead, and that his rule would soon come to an end, if he attempted to be more. Some Jewish publicists attack the leading Jews as responsible for the situation. It is said that their selfishness was the cause of the fact that the Berlin Treaty remained a dead letter. Of new regulations, only one discrimination against Jewish medical students serving in the army has come to notice. Roumanian medical students are granted the right to postpone their service in the army until they are 28 years of age. To the Jew this privilege is denied. It is typically Roumanian, that a woman physician who was refused appointment on the staff of a hospital, while a Jew received the place for which she applied,

was awarded by a court five thousand francs damages for this insult. One might properly mention Morocco in connection with Roumania. A terrible massacre and pillage, which occurred in the Jewish quarter of Fez, April 17, is nothing unusual in the history of that country, but in view of the slow progress made by French arms, it is rather portentous.

A few days before Rosh Hashanah, September 14, the Russian premier Stolypin was shot by the Jew Dimitri Bogroff, who was in the secret service of the police. Stolypin died four days later, and a week afterward, September 25, Bogroff was hanged. Before his death he asked for the services of a rabbi, but when the condition was made that he see him in the presence of witnesses, he refused. He is not, as was originally reported, the grandson of the converted Jew, Bogroff, author of the "Memoirs of a Jew," but a relation of that man. It was quite natural that the Nationalists should make use of this opportunity. Right in the first session of the Duma, October 28, the Octoberists interpellated the government on the "Jew Mortko Bogroff." This shows the situation, because the Octoberists are a shade lighter than the Nationalists. The new premier, Kokokvzev, in one of his first speeches in the Duma, declared that in fundamental political questions there should be no difference between conservatives and liberals, November 6. This remark was interpreted in favor of the Jews, but the premier dispelled all doubt, when he declared four days later that there was no difference between him and his predecessor on any fundamental political question. Later events amply justified this

statement. The czar himself showed his colors when he presented the anti-Semitic agitator Purishkevitch with his portrait, on the occasion of the centenary of the annexation of Besarabia to Russia, and sent it through a personal messenger. The army officers show in their acts that they are fully worthy of wearing the Czar's uniform. Livkin, Chief of Police of Uralsk, shot two Jews dead in cold blood because, unable to stand his constant extortions, they had lodged complaints against him with the Minister. One Colonel Lilie, after carousing in a company of officers at a Cafe Chantant in Kiev, killed a Jewish pianist who declared that he could not play a march which the Colonel demanded. The Colonel stabbed the man with his sword, and in court declared that he merely tried to beat time, and that the death was accidental. He was sentenced to three months' detention in a fortress.

The third Duma did not fulfill any of the expectations harbored by optimists. The motion to abrogate the Pale of Settlement was referred to a committee which never reported, although two weeks before adjournment a vote was passed, requiring the committee to make a report. On every possible occasion, however, the Duma showed its prejudice. The government of Chelm, originally part of Poland, was incorporated into Russia. In Poland the Jews are enjoying a somewhat better legal situation than in Russia proper, but, when Chelm was divided off from Poland, these advantages were lost, and the Jewish member Friedman properly said that any incorporation into Russia, whether of Manchurian or of Polish

territory, means a new disability for the Jews, February 28. The new law on municipal administration in Poland gives the Jew a modicum of political rights. They may elect from ten to twenty per cent of the members of the city council. It was shown in one case in the government of Suwalki that there are ninety-two Jews out of 107 voters, and that the Russian peasants had not enough voters to fill the required number of places reserved to them on the council. But of course the Jews may not have more than twenty per cent of the seats. A revised law on exemption from military duty excludes the Jew from this privilege. A Jew who is the only support of his family must serve in the army, while a Christian is exempt. Naturally, owing to emigration, the number of Jewish "dodgers" from military service is rather large, and the fine of three hundred roubles for every dodger is exacted with relentless severity. For Besarabia alone these fines amounted in one year to 343,000 roubles. How unjust these exactions are, one instance will prove. A widow was made to pay two fines for two sons, supposed to be two months apart in age. The general attitude of the central government is clearly defined by "Rossya," an organ of the government, which says: "The government is attacked for denying to Jews equality of rights. This is like asking that wild beasts should be let loose on defenseless human beings."

"If a ruler listens to words of falsehood, all his servants are wicked,"[2] and if the Czar sends his portrait to one Purishkevitch, every official from the governor-general down, tries to make himself agreeable

[2] Prov. 29, 12.

by persecuting the Jews. The particular Russian fashion is to make friends by brutality and rudeness. In Yalta, the popular winter resort, situated near the imperial castle, restrictions on the right of residence are especially severe. General Dumbadze, the governor, is one of the worst of his type. He expelled seventeen members of an opera company that was to give performances during the winter, although some of them possessed the legal right of residence, and the city council was willing to vouch for the others. The manager of the opera sues the governor for damages in the Senate. The Senate sends a regular order to the governor, asking him to file his plea. The governor curtly replies that he has no time for such business, that he has no money to spend on stamps, and that he wishes to be left alone. The Senate meekly dismisses the suit.

It is the custom for laborers in Poland to cross the border line into Germany in search of work at harvest time, or on other occasions when labor is in demand there. In such cases the pass port charges are usually remitted, but to Jewish laborers, who went to work in the Silesian coal mines, this favor was denied by the governor of Piotrkov. One of the most ingenious inventions of the resourceful Russian bureaucracy was the order of the Minister of the Interior requiring that the merchants of the first and second Guild, who have the right to travel a certain time in the year, usually six months, outside of the Pale, shall have regular books in which the time which they spent outside the Pale is recorded, thus giving the police an opportunity to know at a glance whether the time

limit has or has not been overstepped. This measure is so cumbersome that the leading chambers of commerce protested against it, and the Minister consented to suspend the order until January 1.

The Minister of Justice, blessed with the euphonious name of Shtcheglovitov, finds himself inconvenienced by the circular of Stolypin, which ruled that Jews who lived outside of the Pale prior to August 1, 1906, shall not be disturbed. He appeals to the Senate with the usual scrupulousness of the Russian autocrat, to have the legality of this circular tested. The Senate is equally scrupulous, and denies its own competency to act. The main purpose of the frequent expulsions is evidently the desire of the government to influence the elections for the next Duma. The Jews would naturally join the liberals, and might help them carry the elections in certain places, where otherwise the reactionaries will win. The intimidation of the Jewish electors exceeds anything known in the history of parliamentary bodies. Any number of governors, as those of Odessa and Chernigov, threatened the Jews with pogroms, if they should dare vote for any but reactionary candidates. The governor of Yekaterinoslav summons the rabbi to his office and directs him to advise his congregation not to go to the polls, as any political activity might lead to pogroms. The Senate assists in this policy. It declared that only such Jews have the right to vote outside of the Pale who have the right of permanent residence there, June 22. It would be idle to enter into the details of the complex legislation on the Jewish rights of residence, but it will suffice to make the situation clear

when it is learned that in Nikolayeff the number of Jewish voters was in this way reduced from 2,640 to 300. One must remember that Nikolayeff, as a naval port, is subject to special restrictions, and therefore has not as large a Jewish population, as have St. Petersburg and Kiev, where the effect of the law will be still more severe. The right of residence is otherwise subjected to all sorts of narrow limitations. At Nizhnij Novgorod, the Jews were prohibited from leasing ground at the fair. In Tumen, Siberia, they were even prohibited to attend the fair.

The head of the department of Instruction cannot be expected to allow his colleagues of the Departments of the Interior and Justice to excel him in "patriotism." It is really marvelous, how it is possible to find new restrictions outside of plainly prohibiting Jewish children from attending any school. But the inventive genius of Bureaucracy is simply inexhaustible. His Excellency, M. Kasso, finds out that preparatory classes of secondary schools are not primary schools in which no percent limit exists, and therefore Jewish pupils are only admitted according to the per cent limit of secondary schools. Professional schools, as schools of art, music and elocution, are neither secondary nor academic institutions, and consequently Jews cannot attend them who do not possess the right of residence in that particular place. Twenty-five scholarships are established for medical students who after graduation are willing to settle in agricultural colonies in Siberia. The matter is not too small to establish a new restriction. Jewish students are ineligible for such scholarships.

The Church councils of the thirteenth century have promulgated canons, prohibiting Jews from dealing in Church utensils. The Russian Police is sufficiently erudite to remember that law. It Institutes a search in Jewish music stores in St. Petersburg, finds phonographic records of Church chants, and seizes them as contraband. A Jew in Kiev has some business at the office of the Governor-General. Ascending the main stairway, he is accosted by an official who declares that a Jew must use the back stairs in every Russian government building. The Jew replies that in such a case the apostles would have to use the hatchway too; for this little instruction in Church history, he is sentenced to a week in jail for blasphemy. The principle that the Jew should be excluded from participation in the economic development of the country is another concern of patriots. The governor of Proskuroff would not allow a Jew to be director of a bank. The association for the promotion of cotton culture in Turkestan excludes Jews from the lease of land for cotton cultivation, and extends this prohibition to Societies admitting Jews or Armenians to membership.

For about a year and a half, poor Mendel Beilis is languishing in prison under the charge of having killed the boy Andrew Yushtshinski. The charge has been clearly disproven by a courageous journalist, who, assisted by a clever detective, succeeded in establishing absolute proof that the boy belonged to a family of burglars, and being ill-treated by his stepfather, had threatened to give the secrets of that gang away to the police, and therefore was murdered.

The Courts, however, act like a well known "reasonable orthodox," who, being informed that lard is used in the manufacture of crackers, said, he did not know it, and when he was invited to obtain proof for the allegation in a large bakery, he said, "I do not want to know it." Courts, Church circles, reactionary politicians, and the whole ilk of parasites around them, do not want to know that Beilis is innocent. They started an agitation in the Duma before the evidence of Beilis' innocence was made public, but refused to enter into a debate afterwards, and M. Kasso would not allow pamphlets proving the baselessness of the blood ritual charge to be distributed in the schools.

The Minister of Justice devised another scheme of persecution. He declared that assistant lawyers must be confirmed by him. The somewhat complicated situation is this: The number of lawyers in Russia is restricted and every one who wishes to practice must wait until he is appointed to a vacant place by the Minister. In such a case, he becomes a sworn attorney. Up to that time he is an assistant attorney. The latter position was until this year entirely free. Now the Minister has declared that even this position requires confirmation by him and that Jews can only enter it in definitely limited number. The Senate not merely indorsed this rule, but declared it to be retroactive.

This record of persecution is practically endless. People born and raised in a free country have no idea what in the eyes of Muscovite policy is considered special privilege. Thus the Senate declared that rivers and lakes are real estate, and that there-

fore Jews cannot lease fishery rights. Another decision confirmed an order of the Minister, closing a literary society at Minsk, because occupation with Jewish literature is apt to spread hatred between the various classes of Russian society. The plainest thing would be the enactment of the policy advocated in the platform of the Nationalist party, that wishes the Jews kept out of every decent occupation, not caring whether they starve or emigrate.

The year 5671 ended with a severe crisis in the Zionist camp. It was the threat of a secession by the Misrachi, who were provoked at the radical methods of Bible teaching in the Gymnasium at Jaffa. On the one side the extreme orthodox who were always opposed to Zionism chuckled "I told you so," and on the other hand, the opponents of Zionism saw in this controversy the beginning of a slow disintegration. Nothing of the kind has happened. The majority of the Misrachi decided to remain in the organization. Another victory achieved was the healing of the breach between the two branches of English Zionists, the English Zionist Federation, and the Order of Ancient Maccabaeans. Both amalgamated, forming a Joint Zionist Council of the United Kingdom, April 16.

The pre-Zionistic societies of "Lovers of Zion," notably those of Galatz, Roumania, and of Odessa' celebrated their thirtieth anniversary, and may look back with gratification at the achievement, for, while Herzl condemned their work as ill-conceived, though well intended, the Great Action Committee, at its last meeting, November 5-6, in passing resolutions in

favor of practical work, actually returned to these old ideals. The Basel platform with its idea of an internationally guaranteed Home for the Jewish people still stands—on the paper, but in reality the movement is now leading toward the economic reclamation of Palestine, and toward the raising of the intellectual level ot the Palestinian Jews.

Asher Guenzburg, the celebrated Hebrew essayist, who at one time provoked Herzl by his severe criticism, is at his old game again. He wants a "Kultur-center." Undoubtedly progress has been made. Zionism has not only won so prominent a man as Nathan Strauss, but has the backing of the German Hilfsverein, whose educational work is so successful that the Alliance Israelite has resolved to abandon its work in Palestine. Unfortunately the dissensions within the Alliance continue. It seems that the controversy on Morocco precipitated the whole trouble. Both the German and the French wish to display their patriotism. Mission work naturally suffers under such conditions. Jacques Faitlovitch succeeded in raising the means for another expedition into Abyssinia. Results will have to be awaited. In general, it is rather remarkable how little interest Jews take in such efforts. The Mission to China, established in Hong Kong a few years ago, died of inanition. The numerous converts to Judaism in Russia, whose existence just in that country is surely a triumph of Judaism, received no help whatsoever. In Hungary there is a little village community, consisting of typical Magyars, who have become strictly observant Jews. We who constantly proclaim our condemna-

tion of the racial theory of Judaism have nothing to spare for these poor people. Their rabbi was paid by some private individuals, but his appeal to come to the aid of his flock by building for them a synagog, remains unheeded. Every interest turns on economic questions, especially on the question of how to provide a field for emigration from countries of oppression. A meeting of public workers held in St. Petersburg, January 19, which proposed an international congress in America for the deliberation of this question met with no encouragement. Sometimes agitation seems to be overdone. In the South African parliament Jewish members protested against a new immigration bill, which was not directed against the Jews, but against East Indians.

It is natural that under such conditions the religious question receives little attention. The most important event along that line was the establishment of the "Agudas Yisorel," an organization comprising the orthodox Jews all over the world. It was founded at Kattowitz, May 28, and it is too early yet to speak of its prospects. Important seems to be the inauguration of the Rev. Israel I. Mattuck, as minister of the Jewish Religious Union of London, January 20. The calling of an American minister to England means the beginning of a conquest of Europe by American religious ideas, and the indirect effects are still more remarkable. The old reform congregation, established in 1842, is contemplating progress, and the orthodox synagogs within the jurisdiction of the United Synagogue are contemplating slight reforms, especially the introduction of prayer in the vernacular.

Of some interest also is the publication of an abridged prayer book with Italian translations, though with the bashful sub-title "per uso non uffiziale."

The internal crisis in Turkish Judaism has been overcome. Chief Rabbi Nahum gained his point by his resignation, tendered May 31. A new consistory was elected, June 30, which seems to have succeeded in settling the most serious controversy, the trouble between the Ashkenazi and the Sefardi portions of the community of Constantinople. Of other events it is hardly worth while to speak in this connection. A Hebrew Day, held at Lemberg November 19-20, is not likely to prove a strong and popular movement. The Eastern Council of Reform Rabbis, which aroused a strong protest on the part of the Central Conference, as a schism, disclaimed any intention of being more than a local organization. The condition of the French rabbis remained weak. They resolved to allow the remarriage of parties divorced by the state, under the condition that they sign an agreement at the marriage looking to such an event. A real achievement was the change in the constitution of the Deutsch-Israelitischer Gemeindebund, which gives a more just representation to the large congregations. It was an achievement of which Prof. Martin Philippson, the retiring president, has reason to be proud.

Of the literary activity extending over a whole year, it is manifestly impossible to speak, unless this report would be a mere catalog list. The one book which created a literary stir was Werner Sombart's "The Jews and Political Economy," to which the author published as sequels two pamphlets, entitled

"Conversions of the Jews" and "The Future of the Jews." In the latter he showed his anti-Semitic heart, although the Zionists acclaimed him. There is undoubtedly great scientific merit in his book. He has proven that the Jews by their commercial activity contributed a great deal to the development of civilization, but he paralyzed his merit by the declaration that this is due to their selfishness, and that this selfishness is the consequence of their religion. It is only consistent that he wishes the Jews to remain apart, and that he advises them not to try to obtain official positions, as in this way they irritate their neighbors. The Midrash[3] properly says, "We desire neither the honey nor the sting of the bee."

The next year will be a leap year of 385 days, the longest in the Jewish calendar. Let us hope that we shall be privileged to chronicle pleasanter news.

[3] Num. Rabba, 20, Tanhuma, ed. Buber, p. 136.

THE YEAR 5673—A RESUME.*

THE review of last year published in these columns, began with a quotation from St. Augustine. It is just a mere accident, that this year's review will begin with a quotation from Martin Luther, Augustine's most consistent disciple. That fatalism of Augustine, seeing in immorality a mere disease, in Luther, as is often the case, was coupled with an exactly opposite idea. He was the advocate of rebellion against authority. "Councils may err, and councils have erred," he said in his famous address before the Reichstag, April 18, 1521. This conviction that a view is not true, though at one time it was generally held, is more strongly presented by Goethe, "The Great Heathen," who said:

"Es erben sich Gesetz' und Rechte wie
eine ew'ge Krankheit fort."

This great genius, like Luther, shows his limitation. Luther, the rebel against authority, approved of the burning of Servetus, who only consistently carried out Luther's principles, when he denied Trinity. Goethe, who speaks of law as an inherited disease, which is different from that only true law which is born with us, is happy, when he hears that the new ruler of his native city retained in the new legislation many of the disabilities of the Jews.[1]

*The American Israelite, October 2-9, 1913.

[1]Mitteilungen aus dem Verein zur Bekaempfung des Antisemitismus, 1899, p. 258. Ludwig Geiger: Goethe, Bettina und die Frankfurter Juden in: Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, 1903, 0. 474-477.

Germany is entering into an era of centenaries. Breslau has already celebrated the liberation from the yoke of the Corsican despot. Bavaria gave a great state's affair in the hall erected in memory of the fiftieth anniversary of the event, and we may suppose that the anniversary of the battle of Leipsic will be celebrated in great style, although Boerne[2] declared already ninety years ago, that it meant less to the Germans then, than the Maccabaean victory meant to the Jews. The latter, who on the fifth anniversary of the battle, October 18, 1818, dedicated the first Reform temple in Hamburg, will undoubtedly have reason to celebrate this centenary from a different point of view. It meant to them a reaction, which made itself very strongly felt in Goethe's home town. There, where the second legislation of Bishop Dalberg, Grandduke by the grace of Napoleon, had given them, in 1811, complete freedom, in consideration of $162,000 which they had paid, the old privileged classes, to whom Goethe's family belonged, demanded nothing less than a return into the ghetto.[3] Realities are always stronger than theories, and principles are never carried out consistently when they conflict with the ideas of the times. Even the most reactionary countries, like Bavaria and Mecklenburg, which during Napoleonic time had adopted a more liberal legislation, could not take back all the concessions they had made. Prussia remained true to her traditional bureaucratic discipline, and the concessions granted by the edict of March 11, 1812, were, with

[2]Heine: Ludwig Boerne, 1. Buch, ed. Hamburg, 1876, VII, 144.

[3]Jost: Neuere Geschichte der Israeliten, 1, 23-31. Berlin, 1846-1847.

one exception, not repealed. The Jews remained "Buerger and Einlaender," although the application of the law to the newly acquired provinces was denied, and it was otherwise as narrowly interpreted as hairsplitting would permit.[4] Demagogues hoping to utilize prejudices for the revival of mediaevalism, made use of that hostile sentiment prevailing amongst the population, and its results were miniature pogroms, which enriched the dictionary by the term of "hep-hep."[5] Our age has not outgrown this policy, and its evidence is anti-semitism. Goethe is right, law and statutes are a hereditary curse. You may prove to perfection that they are illogical, but they have their beneficiaries, who are unwilling to forego the advantages of their privileges, and the masses are blind worshippers of what exists. Edward Stilgebauer, like Goethe, a Frankfurter, and the son of a pastor at that, tells us in his "Goetz Krafft," very likely from his own experience, how the Frankfurter is taunted by the officer of the guards, because he comes

[4]Die buergerliche Gleichstellung der Juden in Preussen. Verhandlungen des Hauses der Abgeordneten vom 24-27. April und 10. Mai 1860. Brann: Geschichte der Juden in Schlesien. Breslau, 1896, 1897, 1901, 1907. Freund Ismar: Die Emancipation der Juden in Preussen, I,234 et seq. Berlin, 1912. (Freund Wilhelm) Die gegenwaertig beabsichtigte Umgestaltung der buergerlichen Verhaeltnisse der Juden im preussischen Staate. Breslau, 1842. Geiger: Geschichte der Juden in Berlin, I,192 et seq. Berlin, 1870. Kollenscher: Rechtsverhaeltnisse der Juden in Preussen, Berlin, 1910. Michaelis: Die Rechtsverhaeltnisse der Juden in Preussen seit dem Beginne des 19. Jahrhunderts. Berlin, 1910. Maser: Die Juden in der Frei-und Reichsstadt Dortmund, p. 8, 38. Witten, 1912.

[5]Graetz: Geschichte, XI, 356-360. Bamberger: Beitraege zur Geschichte der Juden in Wuerzburg-Heidingsfeld, p. 17-26. (Wuerzburg) 1905. Krollmann: Warum gab es im Jahre 1819 eine Judenhetze? Berlin, 1899. Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1908, 102, 1909, 80-83.

from a Jew town.[6] In Frankfurt surely his Excellency von Goethe could learn, that law is a hereditary curse.

This heredity is naturally strongest in the Catholic church. Even on free American soil, in a country, which by theory and tradition, has been open to all, regardless of creed and race, the French Canadian Catholics, are still appealing to the sentiments which made the Dreyfus scandal possible. M. Plamondon, who advocates in a lecture at Quebec, the revival of the legislation of Pope Innocent III, and Paul IV, and Bishop Cloutier of Three Rivers, who in an address to the Catholic youth, speaks of "the race that devours the substance of our people," are under the spell of the curse of heredity. So are all representatives of a privileged class. Christian Reisner, a Methodist minister, who, judging by his name, comes from a country, where today his church is suffering from disabilities, though its members individually are free from them, speaks flippantly of "the chosen people," who are a curse to this country. The Alpha Delta Phi fraternity revokes the charter of the chapter of the City College of New York because the institution has too many Jews and—this is the only possible interpretation—the true spirit of the fraternity cannot exist in an atmosphere, so saturated with the Semitic spirit. Samuel Litman is refused the appointment as an officer in the state militia of New York, because even in this country, and in a voluntary organization, the hereditary curse prevails which bars Jews from positions of officers in the

[6]Stilgebauer Edward: Goetz Krafft. Die Geschichte einer Jugend. 4 voll. Berlin, 1905.

German army and excludes them in Russia from the navy, and even from positions as non-commissioned officers in the army.

Privilege in every shape will fight for the retention of its monopoly. The American college professor is hardly a privileged person. Whether we like to admit it or not, our social structure is still governed for the most part by material achievements, and the popular hero of the nation is the successful financier, the base-ball player, or prize fighter. While American universities have no decorations, no titles of privy councillor, no memberships of academies to confer on their staff, they, on the other hand, on account of their isolation, create a certain class spirit. When David Starr Jordan, ex-president of Leland Stanford University, spoke of the invisible empire, founded by the pawn broker, Rothschild (November 9), he surely knew what his hearers had in mind when he said "pawnbroker." The remark was made in an address, delivered in advocating the international peace movement. It is certainly interesting that at the same time a German anti-semitic paper blamed the Jews for the maintenance of the peace with England, and the Jew Alfred H. Fried was given the Nobel prize for his work in the interest of the peace movement. This privilege which can only express itself in drawing social lines, showed itself further, when Prof. Jacques Loeb, one of the world's greatest celebrities in biology, was blackballed by the Century Club. It is hard to decide, whether this movement in universities is to be traced back directly to German influence, or whether it is the result of similar conditions. For

the first hypothesis we have the testimony of one Dr. Joseph Kurtz of Los Angeles, who was so tactless as to use a dinner given in honor of the Kaiser's birthday to attack his political opponent Meyer Lissner, as studying in his Talmud the story of David and Goliath, (January 27). Another support of the same theory is found in Price Collier's' essay, "Germany and the Germans from an American Point of View," published in Scribner's Magazine for January. We read there of "an oriental race, which has taken the cream off the German prosperity," "of the world of semitic haggling and exchange," and the climax of all this meanness is the statement about "sliding over the ship's side in women's clothes to live when it is a moral duty to be drowned." This impertinent statement was made shortly after Isham had saved himself from the wreck of the Titanic, while Ida Straus preferred to die by the side of her husband. Statements of such character in a popular magazine are both a sign of what is popular, and a force in molding popular opinion. When a writer in the "Saturday Evening Post" of January 11th, speaks of New York as being owned by the Jews, he is bound to create and to foster prejudice, though he may not have any hostile intentions, and very likely has none, as he adds that they own New York, because they are a pioneer race. The popular mind, however, is more likely to retain that one part of the statement, which says that the Jews own New York. No better is a similar statement, made by Wallace Irwin, in a cheap story entitled "The Rot Writer," published in "Everybody's Magazine," December, 1912. Without

any logical connection with the plot, the author introduces "a vast flabby juggler, who presented his mighty stomach to a small greenish Hebrew, whose nose curled decoratively like the end of an old-fashioned balustrade." It may be without the slightest intention of arousing prejudice, but it is as Goethe says:

"Man spricht vergebens viel, um zu versagen; Der andrere hoert von allem nur das Nein;"

The decisive point is not what one wishes to say, but what effect his statement has. One thing, however, we can record with satisfaction. It does not seem possible that this country will ever develop an antisemitism that can become a political factor. Pine Bluff, Ark., elected a Jew as mayor. His opponent sent out a circular, warning against the election of the Jew Bloom, because the Jews have ruined every Christian nation, where they held office. Bloom was elected, and it is certain that the Jews of Pine Bluff cannot have anything like a majority of the vote. The "Dallas Morning News" of September 23, 1912, had the abominably bad taste, to write after the nomination of Oscar Straus by the progressives, as governor of New York, that the republicans and democrats would have to nominate Messrs. Gyp the Blood and Lefty Louie (two notorious criminals.) The paper apologized, and one may accept this apology as a sincere statement that some penny-a-liner thought he was very smart, and the responsible editor overlooked this infamous libel. Far more serious is a statement of the 'Independent" (March), discussing the refusal of the New York

Board of Education to grant a year's leave of absence to a teacher, who was about to become a mother. The "Independent" claimed that this action was due to the foreign population, among whom are "people who thank God daily for not having created them a woman." This is a meaner libel than the insulting statement of the "Dallas Morning News." It is true such a statement is found in the old prayer book, but it is also true that respect for and tenderness towards women, is characteristic of the Jewish people. In addition, this statement, while found in the Talmud (Menahot 43, b) is also found in Greek literature, and ascribed respectively to Plato and Socrates.[7] The "Independent" is further remembered for a most venomous article from the pen of Goldwin Smith, published seven years ago, in which the pogrom of Bialystok was directly defended. Still in spite of these facts and in spite of occasional reports of Jews being refused admittance to a hotel, or residence in an exclusive section of a city, the "Evening Herald" of Los Angeles, January 24th, was right, when, speaking of Mary Antin's book, "The Promised Land," it said that "the Gentile and the Jew will never clash in the United States, as they have in Russia, Germany, France, and Roumania," It might perhaps have been proper to add, England, for in England alarming symptoms have developed. The agitation against Sir Stuart Samuel, M. P., for having entered into a business contract with the government, while a member of the House of Commons, and against

[7]Kaufmann in Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, 37, p. 14-18. 1893. Oesterr. Wochenschrift, 1908, 714.

Herbert Samuel, and Sir Rufus Isaacs, both members of the cabinet, for having speculated in Marconi stock, knowing that the company would receive an important grant from the government, were inspired by antisemitic motives. The "Liverpool Daily Post" March 29, expressly stated that this agitation had a strong Roman Catholic backing and the "News Times," edited by the Catholic antisemite, Hilaire Belloc, appealed to Israel Zangwill to become a candidate for Parliament, in order "to keep the Jewish gamblers and grafters out of politics." As if to warn us against the optimism that antisemitism is bound up with bigotry, we soon afterwards heard of H. Snell, a lecturer of the London Ethical Culture Society, who said that: "We are tied up and limp along like crippled Jewish slaves behind Jehovah's ark of covenant." Incidentally the Jews are blamed for retarding the religious progress of the world. Usually they are blamed by the orthodox of all denominations for destroying reverence. A strong appeal to popular prejudice was a statement of Mr. F. F. Smith, M. P., who in a campaign speech in favor of protection, December 21, said that "wealth is leaving the country, and in return England is getting Polish Jews and anarchists."

Countries like Germany and Austria, in which free speech and religious liberty are still innovations, naturally have a stronger antisemitic movement. In priestridden Austria it is chiefly clericalism which wields this weapon. A Dominican friar, Schnee in Olmuetz, preaches a sermon against cremation, in the course of which he utters the kind wish that the

Jews and socialists may be burned, and generously offers to carry the kindling for that purpose. The saints of his order like Peter Arbues, have done it actually. Why should not a monk cherish the ambition of being once made a saint? The agitation, however, is by no means confined to the clerical camp. The German youth in various universities, have established a record in the course of last year in anti-Jewish demonstration. The University of Vienna had even to be closed, on account of the continuous rows between Jewish and nationalistic German students. Dr. Emil von Hofmannsthal, a young lawyer, who addressed a students' society on the question of duelling, was interrupted by a courageous son of Teut, with the remark: "We will not allow a Jew to speak of honor, because Jews possess no honor." Being sued in court, the brave Teuton tried to sneak out by the declaration that he did not mean Dr. von Hofmannsthal personally, and did not know that the latter was a Jew. This silly pretense did not help him any, and he was sentenced to two months in jail, but it remains a depressing fact that any immature nobody considers himself entitled to insult a reputable man, whose great grandfather was ennobled for his public spiritedness at a time, when the Jews were living under the severest disabilities, and whose family has given to Vienna a poet of international fame. The inhumanity, which is one of the symptoms of antisemitism is illustrated in two remarkable incidents. The city council of Grado refused permission for the building of a Jewish sea-shore sanitarium, and a lieutenant in the army, asked

to contribute to a fresh air fund for Jewish children, replied that it was an insult to a man, wearing the uniform of an officer, to ask him to do anything for Jewish children. And yet they are digging in Eisenmenger to prove that the Jews have a different code of morals when dealing with non-Jews.

Similar are the conditions in Germany. The narrow ecclesiastics, and the members of the titled nobility are in the forefront of antisemitic agitation, and yet, during the last year ample proof was furnished to show that the materialistic view of every action, if it be Jewish, is not confined to Jews. A trial in court proved beyond any doubt that officers in the army, from which Jewish officers have to be barred in order to keep it free from the mercenary habits of the Jews, had sold secrets to the Krupp interests. Poor "Kreuzzeitung," unable to defend its clients, merely said that the whole affair is a sign of the growing Americanism and that if the owner of the Krupp gun works were a Herr Cohn, the whole affair would have been hushed up. The organ of the Junker party evidently forgot that when such a suspicion was uttered against Isidor Loewe's gun works twenty years ago, the scamp Ahlwardt received the enthusiastic support of its own partisans, who deeply regretted that they could not make a case out of his silly allegations. The sentiment in these circles is reflected by a story told in the "Maerz" of Munich, whether true or not. It is claimed that the oldest son of the crown prince called a Jewish boy in a winter resort "Frecher Judenjunge." While officially this statement was neither confirmed nor denied,

another fact is officially confirmed. At a reception given to the emperor in Koenigsberg, February 5, the lot had decided that a representative of a Jewish student society should call for three cheers to His Majesty, but before he had any chance to do so, a member of an exclusive fraternity stepped forward, on the ground of an arrangement with the university authorities to save His Majesty the humiliation of receiving a "Hoch!" from a Semitic mouth. The universities are, and have been the hotbed of the antisemitic movement. Prof. Ernst Cassirer had to leave Germany, because he could not be appointed professor ordinarius of philosophy in Marburg, the minister not wishing that this chair, occupied for many years by Hermann Cohen, should again be filled by a Jew. The most brutal expression of antisemitism is the restriction amounting to a practical exclusion of Russian Jewish students from German universities. This hostility led to an actual murder in the case of Alfred Weiser, a Russian Jewish student of the polytechnic of Darmstadt, who was stabbed to death in an antisemitic row. How unprincipled the agitators are in their methods, is proven by the Staatsbuerger Zeitung, which stated that Prof. Graetz had said that revolutions are the star of Israel. Needless to say, Graetz, who made some imprudent statements in speaking of the effects of the French revolution on. Germany, was never guilty of such a wild remark. While this hostility is part of the snobbery connected with public offices, it is not restricted to such. Various prominent authors are continually denouncing Jewish writers, as lacking the German spirit, and

unfortunately some disappointed Jews are adding fuel to the fire. Moritz Goldstein admitted this allegation in an article contributed to the "Kunstwart," and the editor of the latter magazine, Ferdinand Avenarius, was quite happy to have such state evidence.

We would not live in a world of telegraph, and railroad, were such a cue not taken up by writers of other nationalities. Leon Daudet, the small son of a great father, or as the Talmud (Baba Mazia, 83,b) puts it: "Vinegar the son of wine," calls for the overthrow of the Jewish republic. Mahomet Chaer Aladdin, the brother of a former pasha of Jerusalem writes in the face of Turkey's experience, that not Europe, but the Jews are the real peril for Turkey. The president of a bankrupt bank in Zuerich, consoles the mourning creditors with the remark, that the "grain Jews" were responsible for the failure of the institution, which he managed. A high-class restaurant, opened in an Amsterdam department store, owned by a Jew, charges Jewish customers higher prices than others, in order to keep them out. This is done in the country of William the Silent, who nearly four hundred years ago proclaimed the principle of religious liberty, when he wrested his country from the clutches of Spanish despotism. Why should we wonder that in consequence of this relentless agitation, the most malicious of all libels against the Jews, the blood accusation, flourishes. Fortunately no individual case of last year became very serious, but we hear of it in Russis, in Poland, in all parts of Austria, in the Polish provinces of Prussia, in the

Greek cities of the Balkans, as Solonica and Smyrna, and even in New York a Polish woman claimed that her husband had sold their boy to the Jews for Passover. More humiliating still is the case of Asmara, in the Italian colony of Africa, where an Italian constable searched the synagogue to find traces of such a supposed crime. We will trust, however, in the genius of history, fortified by the recollection suggested by the centenaries celebrated during this year, that humanity must progress.

Und wenn dir oft auch bangt und graut,
Als sei die Hoell' auf Erden,
Nur unverzagt auf Gott vertraut!
Es muss doch Fruehling werden.

Geibel.

It is wonderful what a great inspiration we can draw from Goethe, even we Jews writing on Jewish subjects, and fully conscious of the regrettable fact that the wonderful genius, the despiser of Christianity, was still enough of a Frankfurt patrician to wish for the maintenance of the ghetto.[8]

"Amerika, Du hast es besser" is the wonderful word that he coined. There is a great advantage in a country, which is not burdened with feudal tradition, and with a recognition of a state's religion. That in spite of all this there is a residue of mediaevalism, deeply rooted in the heart of the population, the history of antisemitism in the past year has shown. Politically our country has one problem to deal with, which is directly concerned with the Jews. The abrogation of the Russian treaty became a fact, Janu-

[8]Allg. Zeitung des Judentums, 1903, p. 474-477.

ary 1st, and both national conventions of 1912 indorsed the action of the government. The matter now has rested for a year in statu quo. The rumor that the United States government would enter into an agreement with Russia, thus following the example set by the Czar's government, which has issued "temporary laws," May 3, 1882, prohibiting the residence of Jews in villages, and has "temporarily" for the last thirty years not abolished them,—this rumor which did not seem unlikely, was categorically denied in a letter of President Taft, addressed to Mr. Simon Wolf, the indefatigable champion of Jewish rights, November 26. Governor William Sulzer, the author of the motion to abrogate the Russian treaty, then chairman of the House committee on foreign relations, said the United States would take no step backward on the passport question, and there is indeed no indication that any compromise is contemplated, although President Taft did not mention anything on the status of the question in his annual message, and the department of state declined to act in the case of the journalist, Herman Bernstein, who was expelled from Russia. This latter case was justified, in as much as Russia declared that Bernstein's literary activity was injurious to her interest, and she, like any other country, has a perfect right to expel undesirable aliens on personal grounds. That the president did not mention the present state of the affair in his message, is of no significance. He might have felt that a reiteration of the stand taken by the United States government would only irritate Russia without advancing the solution of the problem.

A mere demonstration, though well meant, are the resolutions passed by the legislatures of New York, January 28, and of Pennsylvania, June 24, against Roumania for disregarding the stipulations of the Berlin treaty. The intercession of the federal government unfortunately did not lead to any tangible result, and Mr. Adolf Kraus in his letter to Secretary Bryan, Aug. 9, only expressed the wish that a future action might be more successful. Indirectly affecting the Jews is the legislation on immigration. Both houses of Congress, after some disagreements, had passed an illiteracy bill, but President Taft had the courage to veto it, February 14. The Senate passed it over the president's veto, February 18, but the House, on February 19, sustained the president, if we may use this term, nine votes being missing for the required two-thirds majority. Meantime a new administration came in, which had different troubles, tariff and currency legislation occupying the entire attention. The Jews would not be very much affected directly by the literacy test. Practically all their male immigrants can read and write, and it is unlikely that the government would not recognize Yiddish in the literacy test. The significance of the incident, especially in view of the narrow margin by which the veto was sustained, lies in the unsympathetic attitude to immigration, and it would be childish to conceal from ourselves the fact that the Jew is not a welcome immigrant. This unpleasant reality will not be altered by some kind, and undoubtedly sincere remarks of President Taft, at the I. O. B. B. celebration, Jan. 19, about the Jews as

lovers of liberty, and as philanthropists. Of highest importance among the acts passed by the state's legislatures is the New York law, making it a misdemeanor for a hotel or theater to discriminate against any person on the ground of race, creed, or nationality, and to advertise such discrimination, publicly in any manner. The bill went into effect September 1st, too late to allow us to judge, how it will affect the fahionable summer hotels. If is not merely an important piece of legislation, but a manly act which sheds credit on Mr. Louis Marshall, who is chiefly responsible for its passage. A self-respecting Jew will not go to a place where he knows he is not welcome, and where he would be made to feel it. It is however, a different thing, whether my neighbor quietly makes me understand that he does not care for my company, or whether he insults me by word and gesture. Against the latter, we certainly ought to be as much protected as against physical violence. It is a rather sad commentary on conditions in Germany, where the law against "Grober Unfug" (misdemeanor) is so pliable, that hotels and summer resorts are permitted to advertise the exclusion of the Jews in offensive terms, as in the case of the Koelner Hof in Frankfurt-am-Main, mentioned before. With the progress of the Jews in public life, we have every reason to be satisfied. Four Jews, two from the state of New York, one from Illinois, and one from California, were returned to Congress. Henry Morgenthau was appointed ambassador to Turkey, which has become in some manner a Jewish post, previously occupied by Solomon Hirsch, and Oscar S. Straus.

Some chauvinists in our ranks, took umbrage at the diplomatic ghetto, as if the president could compel the empress of Germany, or the court of Austria to accept a Jew as social equal, and since foreign governments have a perfect right to decline an ambassador as persona non grata, it would be an empty demonstration, and diplomatically a faux pas, to propose a Jew for such a post. It is just as well to admit, that we are very far from the realization of the picture drawn by F. B. Copely in his "Impeachment of President Israels," published in the American Magazine, December, 1912, which on account of this rather remote possibility, attracted an undeserved attention. The appointment of Carl Louis Alsberg as head of the important bureau of chemistry in the Department of Agriculture, and the call extended to Prof. Cassirer, to fill the chair of philosophy in Harvard, are achievements more worthy of remembrance, especially when we add them to the position gained by Simon Flexner and Jacques Loeb, than if we actually would have a Jew as ambassador in Rome, Paris, or even Berlin. The neighboring country of Canada furnished little to report, unless we repeat the disquieting signs of antisemitic agitation in the province of Quebec.

Goethe's Philistine enjoying the reports: "Wenn die Voelker sich schlagen weit hinten in der Tuerkei" comes to mind in connection with the most epochmaking events in the history of the world during the last year. In spite of Renan, and de Lagarde, who claimed that the Jews are absolutely void of any historic instinct, the old rabbis were fine philosophers of history. They say: wherever a great historic

event is recorded, (Vayehi) it means trouble to the Jew (Megillah 10,b). The "Vayehi" of 5673 meant, and in all probability will mean yet, serious trouble to the Jews. From the 8th of October on, when Montenegro declared war against Turkey, we have had a great deal of suffering to record among our co-religionists in the near east. A new country, Albania, will appear on the map. Her representatives have declared in London that the Jews in their territory shall enjoy full equality, January 20th. But promise is one thing, and fact is another. The Jews in Albania are not numerous. It seems that outside of Monastir there is no congregation of any consequence in that territory, but this did not prevent a paper of the importance of the London Times to assert last year, that the Jews were responsible for the massacre of the Christians in that territory. With more serious anticipation we look upon the development of conditions in the territory, now ceded to Greece. Some men, endowed with vivid imagination, as J. L. Garvin (London Observer, November 3), suggested making Salonica an autonomous free port, to be governed by the Jews. Israel Zangwill, true to the instinct of the dreamers of the ghetto, indorsed this plan. The scheme soon collapsed. On November 8, the city was taken by Greek troops, and on November 12, the story was circulated that a Greek soldier had been poisoned in a Jewish liquor shop, and the Jews were attacked. Naturally the fact was very unwelcome to the Greek government, which did not wish to appear intolerant in the eyes of Europe, when it had drawn the sword, apparently for the liberation

of Christians from Moslem fanaticism. The king prevailed upon the Chief Rabbi Jacob Meir, to deny the report. The rabbi was weak enough to sign such a denial, although he was, at the same time, upon his request, received in audience by the king, for the sake of bringing the complaints of the Jewish community before His Majesty. In spite of the desire of the Greek government to prevent such outrages, two Jews were murdered by Greek soldiers in the streets, December 24, and the feeling of the population showed itself in circulating the absolutely unfounded report that the assassin who killed King George was a Jew. Similar occurrences were reported from the newly acquired territory of Bulgaria, which the varying fortunes of the war afterwards so substantially curtailed. Some of the events, if they were not so very sad, would make us feel like the spectators at a melodrama, when the soldiers are chasing each other off the stage. After a siege of eight months, Adrianople fell into the hands of the Bulgarians, March 26th. The Turks fought bitterly at the London Congress to retain this city, replete with such sacred memories for them. They had finally to yield to the inevitable, but the unexpected always will happen, and when Roumania suddenly appeared on the scene of war, Turkey seized the advantage and reoccupied Adrianople. The Jews of the city were the regular shuttle cock and battledore, between their former Turkish masters, their new Bulgarian captors, and their hostile Greek neighbors. Nobody can predict the outcome of this complicated war game. Meantime the Jews suffered from the

invading army, not merely at Adrianople, but also in various other cities of Macedonia, chiefly in Serres, and while the Bulgarians had circulated the rumor that the Jews had sold military secrets to the Turks, Halil Bey, the last governor of Adrianople, declared that they had asssisted the invaders in looting the houses of Mohammedans. With the participation of the Roumanians in the war, a period of mutual recriminations began. Each one of the belligerents accused the other of having committed unspeakable atrocities. The charges against the Bulgarians are substantiated by the Austrian consul. Servia, however, gave substance to the suspicion, by refusing under a flimsical pretext, to recognize the commission appointed by Mr. Carnegie. The probable truth is, as Heine puts it, that both parties have an odor. Jewish soldiers distinguished themselves in each camp. Captain Dadsha of the Bulgarian army was promoted on the battle field to the rank of major, and many cases of bravery of Jews in the Servian army are recorded. The Jewish officer Moses Amar, who fell in action, was buried with public honors at Belgrade. The Turks would not be human, if in their adversity they would not have turned against the Jews. Strongly antisemitic articles appeared in the leading paper, "Ikdam," and in the outlying provinces like Yemen serious persecutions took place, driving large numbers to Palestine. In the latter province the restrictions on the acquisition of real estate remain in force, in spite of the efforts made by Chief Rabbi Nahum to have them repealed. The main difficulty is the absolute uncertainty of what

will become of the remainder of Turkey. It is rather unlikely that the present condition is more than a temporary makeshift. The disintegration of Turkey began in 1683, when the siege of Vienna had to be abandoned. The immense empire, which had been founded by conquest of an uncivilized horde, was never a state. In 1878 the combined wisdom of European diplomats, assembled in Berlin, believed, or made the world believe, that they had created a settlement of the oriental question. The history of the last thirty-five years proves that their work was a terrible makeshift. It did not last even ten years. Will the present settlement, concocted at London and Bucharest be more permanent? Hardly. None of the parties involved is satisfied. Montenegro and Servia have a grudge against Austria for depriving them of what they consider their just spoils. Bulgaria was deprived of the most important of her conquests. Greece has still some islands to annex, and above all, the question of Constantinople, the most important gateway to the Black Sea, is the cynosure of various powers, notably of Russia. Will not that little strip of Turkey in Europe, whether chalked off by the line from Enos to Midia, or whether increased by Adrianople and the adjacent territory, remain a mere remnant on a bargain counter, on which half a dozen powers cast their longing eyes? Will then Turkey be able to hold her possessions in Asia against the hostile Arab population, which never acquiesced in Turkish rule, and will not the various powers that are forging their way into the interior of Asia, notably Germany and England, try to obtain

a foothold on that little strip of the eastern Mediterranean coast line, which since times immemorial, was the battle ground and the buffer state for various conquerors, the place where Nebuchandezar's and Necho's armies met, and where Alexander and Napoleon landed their troops for the sake of conquering the land of the rising sun. France granted protection to the Jewish "Gymnasium" in Jerusalem, and Russia is filling the country with monasteries and eleemosinary institutions. All this is bound to influence the Jewish settlement in Palestine, but these questions shall be treated in a different place.

Roumania, that state in the Balkans which is now in the forefront of interest, presents a puzzle. Does it actually mean to improve the condition of its outlawed Jews, or does it merely play for time in order to win Europe's sympathy? An association of Roumanian Jews had petitioned the government for legal equality. The king is said to have indorsed this petition as far as the rights of native Jews are concerned. This resolution, rendered last year, was made public early in 1913. The minister of war orders that Jewish soldiers may be promoted to the rank of non-commissioned officers. Rabbi Thenen of Jassy was appointed army chaplain, as far as known the first case on record. M. Mishu, the Roumanian minister to England, stated emphatically, in reply to a question in the "Jewish Chronicle," that the Jews living in a territory annexed to Roumania, would retain the legal status, which they possessed under their former government, March 15 to 18. This would be of great importance to the Jews, living in

the former Bulgarian territory, now annexed to Roumania. Carp, the Roumanian ambassador to Vienna, said in an interview granted to the representative of a Hungarian Jewish paper, that all Jews who served in the army during the war, would be given full citizenship. Ex-minister Plehve denounced in the chamber the inhumane policy of the government towards the Jews, and Senator Lahovary interpellated the government on the question of naturalizing soldiers, who had followed the colors in the war. The minister of finance, replied, somewhat vaguely, that the government will do its best to facilitate their naturalization. A little later a statement was given out that the naturalization would be confined to the conscripted soldiers, and not include the volunteers. Previous experiences are not very encouraging. The treaty of Berlin had given to the Jews full citizenship. Roumania evaded its obligation, by declaring all Jews to be aliens. There was another still more flagrant injustice. By the treaty of Berlin Roumania had come into possession of the Dobrudja, which was formerly Turkish territory. According to the treaty of Berlin the residents of this territory were to retain their former status, which in the case of Jews meant at least full civic equality. The government acknowledged it, but required more than thirty years before the detailed conditions could be drafted. Finally a law, issued April 19, 1909, declared that all those who were Turkish citizens in 1877, should enjoy full equality as Roumanians. One can easily imagine that after thirty two years the Jews did not have their Turkish passports any more, and that owing to the

chaotic condition of Turkish offices, it was impossible to obtain any documents. Meanwhile some prominent factors have espoused the cause of the Jews, George Clemenceau published a fiery article in "L'Homme Libre," June 14, condemning the dishonesty of Roumania, and Luigi Luzzatti, the Italian ex-premier, published similar articles in the "Corriere della Sera." Nor were the Jews inactive. The Conjoint Committee of the Deputies of British Jews, and of the Anglo-Jewish Association, addressed a memoir to Sir Edward Grey, the secretary of foreign affairs, but received a reply, June 9, that the Roumanian minister to London had already given assurances as to the status of Jews living in territories annexed to Roumania. The Roumanian emancipation committee of New York established a permanent organization, with Champ Clark, the speaker of the House, as chairman, June 18, and obtained a tangible action on the part of the United States government, which instructed its ministers to Greece and Roumania to suggest that a clause guaranteeing the rights of the Jews be inserted in the treaty of Bucharest. This request was rejected as unnecessary, because such a guarantee was given by the principles of international law, August 5. Mr. Louis Marshall, the eminent lawyer, considers this reply a victory for the Jews. From the point of view of international law this may be correct, but Roumania has always acted like the Jew who was chided for shaving his beard. He replied: "I asked the rabbi about it." "And the rabbi" said his interlocutor, "gave you permission?" "Oh no," said the sinner, "he distinctly

prohibited it, but who cares for what he says." The question is indeed one of European concern. A Paris court recently sentenced a Roumanian Jew to deportation, but his lawyer declared that the deportation could not be carried out because the man had no home. There is no harm in being optimistic in this matter, but it would not be safe to bank on the promises of Roumanian statesmen.

The divine in the words of the prophets comes home to us with great force, when we see how forcibly their sermons apply to the conditions of our present day. Well might one say, observing the hopelessness of the present situation in Russia, and comparing it with the apparent dawn of a new era eight years ago, "Wherefore does the way of the wicked prosper, wherefore are all they at ease that deal very treacherously?" (Jer. XII, 1). The situation is so disgusting that not only our moral, but even our aesthetic sense rebels against reciting the harrowing tales of inhumanity, wickedness, and the fiendish resourcefulness of a cruelty that makes the horrors of a mediaeval torture chamber come back to us with the force of reality. The Russian Jews might well say to the Czar, with Schiller, "Wir sind so grenzenlos unglücklich, dass wir nichts nach deinem Zorn mehr fragen." The details of last year's story are hardly interesting. It is Isaiah's (XXVIII, 10) curse: "Precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little, there a little, that they may go and fall backward and be broken, ensnared, and taken."

What a revolting monotony! Twenty-four Jews are expelled from Kiev. They appeal to the senate,

and the senate finds that their expulsion was legal. They are the sons of merchants of the first guild, that is, of men who have paid the highest taxes for ten years within the Pale, and thus have acquired the right for themselves and posterity, to reside permanently outside of the Pale. "Good," says the senate, November 23, to the Kiev merchants, "the law gives you the right to reside outside of the Pale, but not to do business there, unless you are yourself merchants of the first guild." "Precept upon precept, that they be ensnared and taken." Now what good will it do us to learn that the police expelled all Jews from Romonovka, Besarabia, although the place was included in the pale by imperial edict of 1904, or that the minister of public instruction refused to grant the petition of the city council of Verchnernepovsk to increase the percentage of Jewish pupils at the Gymnasium, or that the Jew Kleinermann was expelled from the village of Bielowish, where he was born, and where his parents had lived for sixty years, because the law says that only those Jews may live in villages who lived there previous to 1882, while Kleinermann was born after 1882. Only a few of the most striking measures of persecution shall be quoted. Russia celebrated this year the tercentenary of the "benign" rule of the Romanoffs. The Czar issued a manifesto which quashed all fines imposed by courts and authorities, which are below 600 roubles. The Jews rejoiced. The fine of 300 roubles, which is imposed on anyone if a member of his family dodged military service, was in this way remitted. "No," said the minister, "this imperial law only quashes fines

incurred by a felon, but not those imposed upon one for the felony of another." A Jew living in the village of Pitrokovka, government of Kiev, had a daughter who was unfortunately married. She obtained a divorce, and returned with her two children to the house of her father. The police expelled her, because, while she had the right of residence, previous to her marriage, she had forfeited it by removing from the place, and absenting herself for more than three days. A young man came to Kiev to receive medical treatment at the university clinic. The law does not recognize this as a justification of temporary residence outside of the pale. The young man, however, found some place where he was given shelter. In the middle of the night the well known knock of the police is heard. The young man and his brother are hurried into a stable and hidden under a pile of hay. But being of poor health, he was suffocated before the police had left the house. The whole tragedy of the Jewish situation came before the public, when 286 Jews were tried in a court of Moscow for having bought forged certificates as dentists in order to obtain the right of residence outside of the pale. The trial lasted from November 5, 1912 to January 3, 1913, and resulted in 154 men and women being sentenced to one year in jail each, and to losing their titles and privileges, while twenty-four others received a minor sentence. In some of these cases men who were bona fide dentists, could not practice their profession, because they had studied abroad, and while their diplomas were valid they had to prove as Jews that they had served their apprenticeship in the office of a Russian dentist.

In other cases the defendants possessed genuine Russian diplomas, but did not practice their profession, and in most cases they merely had bought their diplomas in order to trade outside of the pale. The plain situation is this. An official either does business by blackmailing the Jews, or works for his promotion by persecuting them. Maklakoff, governor of Tchernigoff, was appointed minister of the interior, December 30. He had won his promotion by so numerous expulsions of Jews that he had proved his patriotism to the satisfaction of the Czar. Why should a member of bureaucracy not learn a lesson from such a career? The governor of Libau ordered the Jewish export merchants to vacate the piers of the winter port. The Chamber of Commerce protests against this order, as injurious to the interests of export trade, but it is profitable to the career of the governor. The elections to the fourth Duma, which was convened November 28, resulted in the return of three Jews. Friedmann who had served in the third Duma, showed in an address delivered December 27, that the government had broken all the promises made from 1904 to 1906, and constantly introduces new restrictions. Miliukoff, the liberal leader, states that the Jews are treated worse than slaves in olden times. He quotes a case of the same governor of Courland, who ordered that the tools of a Jewish mechanic be sold at sheriff's sale for the fine of $300, which the poor man was ordered to pay for failing to produce his son at military conscription. Nobody takes any notice of this fact. One remarkable case of conversion occurred. The monk Heliodore, who persecuted the

Jews in a manner worthy of the inquisitors of middle ages, published an open letter in the press, announcing his withdrawal from the Greek Catholic Church, and asking forgiveness of "the people of Israel, the light of the universe" for the wrong that he had done to them and for the blood of innocent children, which was shed in the pogroms. Unfortunately for one sinner who repents, there are many others who espouse the cause of reaction. The priest Pranaitis, who in 1894 had published an antisemitic pamphlet, was appointed as expert in the trial of ritual murder, which is to be held in Kiev in October. For two and a half years Mendel Beilis is languishing in prison, under the charge of ritual murder. Prominent publicists have proven that the murder was committed by the step-father of the victim, because the boy had threatened to inform the police of the crimes committed by the latter. Various notables of international fame and lately the medical congress of London, have protested against this outrageous libel, but autocracy is bound to have a victim for the satisfaction of the mob, and for the benefit of the church, which expects to strengthen its hold upon the masses by an appeal to the latter's cruel instincts. At the same time the spiritual life of the Jews is to be stifled even in activities, which cannot be checked by restrictions on admission to public schools. Nahum Sokolow was tried for re-publishing in his "Hazefirah" an article on the situation of the Jews in Russia, published by Max Nordau, in "Neue Freie Presse" of Vienna. He proved that the paper, containing the original article, had been sold in the streets of Warsaw without interference by the

police, and the unexpected happened, Sokolow was acquitted. The editor of the Hebrew weekly "Haolam" was less fortunate, and he had to spend two months in prison for writing an article on Zionism. Zionism is the pet aversion of the Russian bureaucrats. A Zionist almanac was suppressed by order of court. Two students of Odessa published a pamphlet appealing for Shekel dues, and the pamphlet was seized. The postoffices have order not to forward any money sent for Palestinian charities, and of late "Die Welt" has ceased to publish the contributions to the Zionist cause from Russia, as it did formerly, because in Russia itself both collection and publication are illegal. Other Jewish cultural schemes fare no better The governor of Wilna prohibited a lecture on the Modern History of the Jews in Russia, and a contributor to the "Besarabski Zhisn" was sentenced to two months in prison for writing an article with the caption "The Jews treated as outlaws." In Kiev the production of Jewish plays is prohibited. A society for Jewish folk music is refused permission to give a concert. Hebrew lectures are prohibited. A society for the relief of sick is not permitted to give a flower parade as a benefit. One might imagine that this systematic persecution on the part of the Russians would bring the Jews the sympathy of other oppressed nationalities. Such seems, however, not to be the case. At a banquet given in honor of a Finnish patriot in Moscow Dr. Tschlenow had the courage of speaking out his mind. The Finns, however, are merely passive in their attitude, while the Poles have developed a form of persecution, which in savagery

rivals the Indians of pioneer days. A Jewish family of eight persons in Pontnew, government of Kalisch, was burned to death deliberately by peasants, who wanted to revenge on these innocent people the defeat of a Polish candidate to the Duma. The attitude of the Jews on this occasion has led to a systematic boycott, which has even spread to the Austrian and Prussian parts of Poland. It is a small matter compared with this fact that the new law on municipal administration in Poland restricted the franchise of the Jews so that they can never elect more than 20 per cent of the members of the city council. This is after all better than the condition in Russia, where they have no franchise in municipal elections. We must conclude with the sad confession, that if there be any hope for an improvement, there is not the slighest indication of it.

In various ways, Austria likes to follow in the footsteps of its powerful neighbor. The minister of war plagiarized his German colleague by a declaration in the "Delegation" that appearance and family must be considered in appointments for the position of army officers, October 1. The matter was repeatedly taken up in the Reichsrat, both by socialists and antisemites. So far, however, Austria has allowed Jews to rise in the army as high as the rank of general, which one Jew attained in active service, while at least five others, serving as colonels, retired with the honorary rank of general, not to mention others who attained the same rank as surgeons, and naval constructors. Other incidents in the Reichsrat were protests against the attacks on the Jews of Salonica, November 26,

denunciation of some chambers of commerce which called for restrictions on the Jews of Galicia, and an interpellation on the case of poor Hilsner, whom the minister is still afraid to propose for pardon, though his innocence of the ritual murder charge for which he was sent to penitentiary for life is well known to everybody. The emperor himself is surely fairminded. He showed it this year by granting a tract of land to the Jewish congregation of Vienna for the erection of a children's hospital, which is to be built from funds bequeathed by the late David von Gutmann. The city council had in vain protested against the building of the hospital on this site. Quite serious were the riots between the German and the Jewish students at the University of Vienna, May 17 and 19, which assumed such proportions that the university had to be closed. The Jewish students in Vienna are persecuted, though they are willing to be Germans. In Lemberg a riot broke out against some Jewish students from Warsaw, because they were found guilty of having attended a Russian university, which is high treason against the cause of Poland. In Rodowska Jews again are attacked by the Ruthenian peasants because they are pro-Polish. In the town of Dukla a Jewish girl teacher, appointed as substitute for the regular teacher who had been called to the colors, could not enter unon her duties, because the school children struck. A petition, signed by 3000 women, demanded of the provincial school board that no Jewish teachers should be appointed for country schools, but in Broczyn, where ninety per cent of the pupils are Jews, the school

board ordered that crucifixes be placed in every school room. The same order was given in the Moravian town of Boskowitz for the Jewish school, because owing to the shifting of the population, the majority of the school children are now Christians. It sounds like a satire, when an antisemetic member of the diet of Lower Austria, who urged the declaration of war against Servia, said that Austria would long ago have declared war, had the victims in Albania been Jews, instead of Roman Catholics. The chauvinistic nationalism of the antisemites, provokes on the other side a Jewish chauvinism. Only in this way can we understand that a scholar of national reputation, like Prof. Leon Kellner, demands in the diet of Bukowina, that Yiddish be recognized as a language, and that the Jews form a separate class of the electorate. It is unfortunately true that conditions in Half-Asia cannot be judged by comparison with our western civilization. Galicia, whose Jewish population forms eleven per cent, returned to the diet only four Jews out of a total of 161. There was an attempt made to reform the antiquated electoral law, but the Roman Catholic bishops protested against it, and this settled the question. This old curse of Poland, which has caused the ruin of the country, is still bent upon fostering the hatred of the population. The new bishop of Tarnow, visiting the city of Dombrowa, was greeted by the Jews, who erected a triumphal arch in his honor. His Grace ordered his driver to pass quickly through the arch, without taking any notice of it. In the Czech countries, where the Jews are supporters of the German party, they meet with

ingratitude. In Bruenn, the capital of Moravia, two antisemites were returned to the diet. The division of the electors into a German and a Slavic electorate makes the support of the Jews unnecessary. Much better were conditions in Hungary, although even there anti-Jewish expressions are occasionally heard in Parliament. The minister of commerce was attacked for granting Sabbath observing Jews the right to keep their places of business open on Saturday evenings until 9:30 ,while the regular closing hour is eight o'clock. The Jews themselves are constantly fighting for recognition as an ecclesiastic organization. The liberals are especially anxious for an established Jewish church, but the orthodox oppose it, unless they should be recognized as a separate church. Hungary is a classic country in the clamor for state's recognition. And this year again a funny incident took place. The minister had to declare that a Mikvah is an indispensable institution of a Jewish congregation. In personal distinction the Jews of Hungary have made wonderful progress during the last year. Francis Heltai was elected mayor of Budapest. He was honored by a letter of congratulation from the primate, by an appointment to the House of Lords, and by the honorary freedom of forty-two cities. Unfortunately he was not privileged to make good the great confidence bestowed upon him, for he died eight months after his election in the prime of life. Of great importance is also the appointment of a Jew to an office which is equal to that of our assistant attorney general. This is the second case of this kind in the history of Hungary. The first was that

of Edward Horn, originally Ignatz Einhorn, who from a Bahur at the Presburg Yeshibah, developed into a reform preacher, and afterwards into a noted political economist. Of great importance was the election of the Orientalist Ignaz Goldziher, as representative of the Hungarian academy to the congress of academies to be held in St. Petersburg. Goldziher logically declined the honor, and therefore the second member elected, also declined. It is a well deserved lesson for the Russian government.

In the forefront of Jewish interest, is the agitation against foreign Jews living in Germany. It expressed itself mostly in discriminations against students at universities, but in Bavaria, restrictions on peddling are but a disguised attempt to keep foreign Jews out of the country. The upper house, upon the plea of the premier, refused to concur in the bill. In the Reichstag the practical exclusion of Jews from commissions in the army, was repeatedly discussed. Lieutenant General von Liebert, April 8th, approved of the practice of the war department, because the case of Turkey showed the harmful influence of any "Fremdkoerper" in an army. The general evidently forgot that the Turkish army was drilled by German officers. Logic is not quite the forte of the feudal lords, else General von Kleist, who said in a letter to the press, that the sentiments of Gen. von Liebert are shared by the whole army, could not have stated in the House of Lords that only Judaism enjoys absolute immunity in Prussia, April 26. The minister of war, like the clerical member Erzberger, made an empty show of liberality by denouncing the existing practice,

or saying that the conditions are regrettable. An important move, however, was made by the clerical party in the Reichstag, when they proposed an amendment to the naturalization law, which declared that all ministers of a recognized "Religionsgemeinschaft" should, through their appointment as such, become naturalized German citizens, June 25. The amendment was passed over the protest of the government, but it is questionable whether it will become law. In their desire to prove that they stand for religious liberty, the clericals in the diet of Hesse opposed a motion to prohibit Shehitah. Here Protestant Saxony, where the prohibition was abolished, is still making attempts to reintroduce the prohibition. There is always a difference between Parliamentary actions and actions of the government's authorities. The Reichstag passed a law, which would allow foreign Jews to become ministers of a Jewish congregation, but a court recently fined the president of a little congregation in the province of Posen, for having engaged a Russian Jew, working in the town as printer, as temporary Hazan for the holydays. In the Prussian diet the question of granting subsidies to small Jewish congregations, as is done in similar cases for Christians, was repeatedly discussed. One of its advocates was Oscar Cassel, who was for this attitude charged by the socialists with Byzantinism. The same charge was made against him for a spread eagle speech, delivered in connection with the centenary of the liberation of Prussia from Napoleonic rule. There seems to be a certain policy in the department of education, favoring denominationalism in schools,

by making allowances for Jewish scruples, as to writing on Sabbath and similar practices. Such orders were issued in Prussia, in Wuertemberg, and Anhalt. Not that there is anything wrong in it, but a century ago the authorities did all they could to prevent what they called the continuation of the aloofness of the Jews. The smaller states continue to legislate on the internal condition of the Jews. Wuertemberg has a new Oberkirchenrat, constituted December 16, and in Bavaria the much needed amendment of the law, regulating the administration of Jewish congregations, was promised by the minister for 1915. In Alsace, where the state pays subsidies to all religious denominations, Jews, like Protestants, complain that the mode of distribution is unfair. In the case of the Jews, however, it would seem that the rapidly disappearing village congregations, would disappear still more rapidly, were it not for the assistance rendered them from public funds. A few cases of personal distinctions deserve being noticed. In the elections to the Prussian diet ten Jews were returned, of whom only one is a socialist. Poor Stoecker will turn in his grave, remembering how he congratulated himself for having driven the Jews out of both the Reichstag and the Prussian diet. The emperor honored the manufacturer Wilhelm Herz upon his ninetieth birthday, by making him privy councillor, and bestowing upon him the title of Excellency. It seems strange, how inconsistent people are. To have to be addressed "Your Excellency" is an unusual honor, but a Jew can get it though he cannot get an appointment as lieutenant in the reserve, of whom there must be

approximately 15,000 in the army. The appointment of a Jew as principal of the Girls' "Gymnasium" in Charlottenburg, would not seem to be a matter of any consequence, but it deserves being recorded, first because it is rare, and the preservation of the German spirit in the schools has always been a plank in the antisemitic platform, and then because it was made the target of criticism in the Prussian diet.

In Great Britain, the agitation against Sir Stuart Samuel, M. P., against his brother Herbert S. Samuel, post master general, and against Sir Rufus Isaacs, attorney general, was inspired by antisemitic tendencies. The firm of Samuel Montagu and Co., had entered into a contract with the government to furnish silver for India. Sir Stuart Samuel, as a member of the firm, was at that time also member of the House of Commons. His action was undoubtedly illegal. The agitation against him was inspired by partisan motives. The government tried to shield Sir Stuart, and it was successful, even the opponents, admitting that the transaction was profitable to the government. Instead of being victimized by a trust, which raised the price of silver, when it was known that the government was contemplating a purchase, the transaction of Montagu & Co., had saved the government a considerable amount of money. The agitation continued for several months, beginning November 11, 1912, and lasting until April 11, 1913, when Sir Stuart was unseated by a decree of the privy council. He was, however, re-elected, and is again a member of the House. The government went even farther, and announced an indemnity bill for

Sir Stuart, for in as much as he was found guilty of illegal voting, he would have to be fined 500 pounds for each vote taken. Of still more acrimonious nature was the agitation against the two Jewish cabinet ministers. It was claimed that both gentlemen had speculated in Marconi stock at a time, when they knew that the government was entering into a contract with the Marconi Company. In the case of Herbert Samuel the allegation was proven untrue. It was quite different with the charges against Sir Rufus Isaacs. His defense was that he owned no stock in the British Marconi company, but he had indeed bought stock of the American Marconi Company. It was further stated that Sir Rufus had acted as a sort of a broker for other members of the cabinet, especially for Lloyd George. The committee of the House of Commons found that the action of Sir Rufus was legal, although it regretted that both he and Mr. George had acted injudiciously, June 18. At the same time it was stated that Sir Rufus had made a false affidavit as to his age when he entered the stock exchange. The motives in this agitation are decidedly antisemitic. The mere fact that Hilaire Belloc championed the cause of the outraged public conscience and that Cecil Chesterton tried to connect Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the attorney general's brother, with the affair, is sufficient evidence, though Belloc claims that he knows of nothing less Jewish than Rufus Isaacs. C. Granville, former editor of Belloc's "Eye Witness," declared the agitation as a conspiracy, equal to the anti-Dreyfus movement. Another matter which came several times before the House was the

question of the passports of English Jews travelling in Russia. Sir Edward Grey repeatedly declared in reply to interpellations, October 17 and 28, that the question had been decided as early as 1862 and 1881, and that Russia had the right to act as she did, on the ground of the existing treaty. He took the same stand in reply to the joint committees of the Delegates of British Jews, and the Anglo-Jewish Association. When these committees asked Sir Edward to procure an audience for them with Mr. Sazonoff, the Russian minister of finance who was on a visit to England, he refused to act on the ground that it would be an interference with the affairs of another country. In all these cases it was evidently Sir Edward's desire to please Russia. Diplomacy has never been troubled with any moral scruples. It merely considers a question from the point of view of its expediency, and anyone could see that Sir Edward Grey avoided all appearance of condemning Russia's inhumanity, or of regretting that the existing treaty had created an unjust condition. He was a little more of a humanitarian in replying to the interpellation of Sir Philip Magnus on the status of the Jews, living in territories to be annexed to Roumania, March 13. In this case Sir Edward declared his sympathy with the spirit of the motion. It is inconceivable, however, what moved the British foreign office to say in reply to the petition of the Jewish Chronicle for protection of the Jews of Salonica that no special outrages on the Jews had been committed, November 25. It is of considerable significance that a Jewish M. P., Sir Alfred Mond, in an address before his constitutents, October

11, criticized the government for not taking sufficient interest in the cause of the Christians in Macedonia. Sir Alfred's father, a native of Germany, was already one of those, who preferred the old policy of "sich nischt zu derkennen geben." Of personal achievements in England during the last year, it is to be noted that with the election of Mr. Samuel Samuel as member of Parliament, the number of Jews in the House of Commons rose to seventeen, a record number, and way above the pro rata of the Jews in the population. Ten Jews, of whom one woman, Miss Nettie Adler, the daughter of the late chief rabbi, were elected members of the London county council, and Mr. Maurice Levy, M. P. was raised to the baronetcy. From English Colonies only a few facts, and these of little consequence, are to be recorded. In Canada the school commissioners of Montreal, have resolved to employ Jewish teachers in the Protestant schools. The schools in the province of Quebec are divided between Catholics and Protestants. The Jews were assigned to Protestant schools, into whose panel they paid their taxes, but the appointment of Jewish teachers is something entirely novel. Of the fierce Catholic agitation against the Jews mention has been made under the heading of antisemitism. The placing of a Shochet of Halifax under indictment is hardly important enough to be considered an event in history, though antisemitic motives are usually underlying such sentimental interest in the animal world. South Africa passed a bill requiring a literacy test for immigrants, and it is to be noted with satisfaction that the knowledge of

Yiddish is recognized as sufficient. It seems that in the South African Union some Jews feel that they constantly have to bring a grievance before the government. Rabbi Landau of Johannesburg bothered the minister of agriculture with the request to make a special rule for wine which is used for Kiddush. Mr. Morris Alexander, member of the Assembly, asked the minister of defense to excuse Jewish members of the national guards from service on Sabbath. The minister in a very obliging letter humorously asked the question, whether there were many Jews in Transvaal who observed the Sabbath in business. In Australia a humanitarian act of Rabbi Cohen of Sidney aroused considerable criticism. Rabbi Cohen had brought some Jewish boys from England, who had been committed to a reform farm. For the domain of personal achievements it ought to be noted that a Jew, Lieut. Col. Monash, was appointed commander of an infantry brigade, which if not giving him the title, places him in the rank of a general.

France gave the observer of Jewish conditions a scare. The minister of war surprised the world by reinstating colonel Paty du Clam, the tool of the Jesuits and the chief conspirator in the Dreyfus case. The matter created such a stir that the minister was forced to resign. But what did he wish to do with this nomination? In all likelihood it was intended to influence the presidential election in the sense in which the antisemitic papers interpreted this remarkable step. France was to be presented as a tool in the hands of the Jews, who controlled the republic through the House of Rothschild. The scheme was a failure,

but, as we see from cases like that of Leon Daudet, it has some advocates. The French students, who demanded the exclusion of foreign Jews from universities, and asked for restrictions on the practice of medicine by foreigners, are following in the wake of the much hated "Prussiens" in persecuting the unfortunate victims of Russian tyranny. After the experience in England, nobody will wonder that President Poincaré refused to act upon the petition of the League of the Right of Man to demand full recognition for French Jews when travelling in Russia. Of French colonies, we have to mention Tunis, which is practically such, where the government stopped a serious uprising against the Jews by the native Arab population. This incident will hardly be conducive to a favorable consideration of the petition, presented by the rabbis of Morocco, to recognize Moroccan Jews as French citizens. The demand is absolutely just, but it is not politic and this is after all the main consideration. Italy furnished no event of any consequence except a few complimentary words spoken by the king on the patriotism of the Jews, the election for the sixth time, of Ernest Nathan as mayor of Rome, and the appointment of Count Carobbio, as minister to Copenhagen. Spain continues to follow the policy of trying to win back the descendants of the Jews which she had expelled in 1492. She protested in Athens against the atrocities, of which the Jews of Salonica were made the victims, and declared her willingness to recognize all Spanish speaking Jews of the Orient as Spanish citizens. It was even reported that a chair for rabbinic literature was to be established

at the University of Madrid. More important is the situation in Portugal, where the question of an extensive land grant to the Ito in Angola occupied the attention of Parliament. In Scandinavian countries we note the appointment of Edward Brandes for the second time, as minister of finance in Denmark, but as an offset, we note also the attack by a university professor on George Brandes, as a Jew. The prohibition of Shehitah in Christiania, where a Jewish community of 600 people has settled within the last decade, is hardly indicative of a friendly spirit. The Swiss Jews recently celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of their emancipation. It is a somewhat optimistic interpretation of history, for while fifty years ago the canton of Aargau was forced to grant the native Jews franchise, some restrictions were still maintained. But it is worth while recording that for the first time a Jew, Lucian Picard, a banker in Frankfurt-am-Main, was appointed Swiss consul.

The most important event in the religious life of the Jewish community was the declaration of principles (Richtlinien) by the convention of liberal Jews of Germany, held at Posen, October 13. "The declaration is far from being radical, if as we ought , we define, radical as the departure from the convictions of a large majority . In fact, one might say that the principles are rather lagging behind the actual convictions of the large majority of Jews in western lands. They were evidently inspired by the idea of a compromise, which would make it possible for all liberal Jews to unite on a common platform. Nevertheless they evoked vivid protests, from the Union of

Orthodox Rabbis of Germany, from the Society for the Conservation of Traditional Judaism in Berlin, which declared that the Richtlinien are in contradiction with historic Judaism, and from the "Free Jewish Union," which represents the Breslau school, having the hereditary right to the title of historic Judaism. It was quite unexpected that in Paris a branch of the Agudath Israel was formed, May 4, with Major Lipman as the chief speaker. While the papers of both parties devoted considerable space to the discussion of the new platform, it does not seem that the public at large is much interested in dogmatic questions. In America the Union of Orthodox Congregations, held its regular meeting without any tangible results, and even without showing any definite plan of action. It does not recognize the view presented by the New York seminary, as its own. The newly founded United Synagogue of America, created Feb. 23, under the presidency of Prof Schechter, does not appeal to the genuine orthodox section of the community. It resents the name neo-orthodox, but it is not taken at its face value by the real orthodox.

If the idea of the orthodox followers of Zionism was that the hallowed environment of Palestine would inspire the new settlers with loyalty to tradition, this hope does not materialize. Orthodox papers report that young men from the colonies in Galilee come horseback riding with lighted cigarettes in their mouth to Tiberias on Sabbath, in order to demonstrate their view of a Jewish nationality, that has nothing to do with religion. Two essays published by Jews in German magazines, which declared that a Jew can

not be a German in the full sense of the word, created such an irritation in the public, that the Zentralverein of German citizens of the Jewish religion, had passed a resolution condemning Zionism, March 30. This was followed by the secession of the Zionist members, who founded a Reichsverein of German Jews. Whether it was wise to divide the forces which ought to be united in protecting the political rights of the Jews, remains to be seen. A quite unique innovation was the foundation of a society of Jewish Freethinkers of which very little has been heard since, perhaps because the Jewish press does not wish to give the movment any publicity. Within Zionism itself a distinct breach is noticeable between the two fractions calling themselves respectively political and practical Zionists. Max Nordau in a remarkable address, delivered before the Paris Zionists, denounced the present administration of the Zionist organization as apostates from Herzl's ideas. Whether Nordau, brilliant man as he is, is a sound politician is open to doubt. He will have to admit that his letter published in the "London Times" of December 29th, asking the powers to make Solonica and environment an autonomous Jewish commonwealth, was an empty demonstration. Ephraim Deinard, who is one of the veterans of Zionism, declares both colonization and cultural work in Palestine as a down-right failure. Reshid Bey, the governor of Palestine, came out with a sympathetic demonstration for Zionism, as long as it is not looking for a Jewish state. While the detailed reports of the last congress at Vienna, are not at hand at this writing, it may be said that the trans-

actions have not resulted in a tangible solution of the difficulties. Ex-president Wolffsohn, who in good Parliamentary fashion became the leader of the opposition, was received with great applause, but he could not propose a political action, which might lead to the realization of Herzl's Judenstaat. An important step forward was the creation of an international health office in Jerusalem, which will unite the health bureau, founded by Mr. Nathan Straus, with the German society for extermination of malaria, and with the society of Jewish physicians and scientists in Palestine. A new girls' school, founded in Petach Tikvah, the oldest and most prosperous colony, represents great progress. Of other achievements the promise of the support of colonization by the Jewish congregation of Vienna is quite an achievement, as is also the courtesy accorded to the congress by the Vienna congregation, considering the bitter opposition with which the movement met, when Herzl originally launched it. The attack by the "London Times," September 28, 1912, on the Jewish colonists as working for the interests of Germany, is not a very serious matter, as the "Times" has for some years been distinctly hostile to Jews and Judaism. Far more serious is an order issued by the Grand Vizier, prohibiting the sale of land to Jews even of Ottoman nationality, but the most serious trouble that Zionism has to contend with is the open hostility of the Bedouins, which led to several murders of guards. Even if the Turkish government should be distinctly sympathetic, we cannot expect that it will succeed any better with the Palestinian Arabs now, than it

has succeeded with the hostile tribes of the Lebanon and of Arabia.

A meeting of the Ito, held at London, at which Mr. Jacob H. Schiff was present, May 22, promised to continue the work of assisting immigration to Galveston for two years. Mr. Leon Brodski of Kiev promised to provide one-half of the necessary funds One must not be over optimistic, in regard to the results of this movement, for any observer of the immigration movement knows, that large numbers of immigrants have settled as far as Seattle, who came via New York, while a goodly number of those who landed in Galveston, have gone to eastern cities, but the immigration to Galveston undoubtedly will help in the absolutely nesessary distribution of the immigrants, and will in a measure at least counteract the moral dangers of overcrowding in the tenements of eastern cities. The Jewish Colonization Association records constant progress from Argentina, though the 20,000 immigrants living in the Argentinian colonies, are in no wise a realization of Baron de Hirsch's expectations. The forming of the Jewish Land Association in South Africa, is a step in the right direction, although the movement is too young to allow any prophecy as to its results. The transactions of the Ito with the Portuguese government for a grant in Angola, have not materially progressed. It seems a pity that the British East Africa project, was abandoned, in view of the reports of the wonderful development of the land along the railroad from Mombasa to Lake Victoria. The result of close observation of all colonization movements for the last

thirty years, shows the inexorable law of history. A people, for two thousand years traders and city dwellers, can not be transformed in one generation into a race of pioneers.

The beautiful saying of the Midrash, that Israel is dozing in ritual observance, but active in works of charity (Midrash Rabba Canticles, V,2) might have been a prophecy, referring to our own times. It would be a long list of names and figures, were one to attempt the enumeration of all acts of charity, performed in one year within the Jewish community. Two smaller instances may head this partial list, in accordance with a beautiful Talmudic legend. Abba Areka, the great Babylonian teacher of the third century, led in prayer at a special service held in a time of drought. His prayer was not answered. He was followed by a simple man, who no sooner had finished his prayer when a downpour of rain began. "Who art thou," asked the rabbi of the man, "and what is thy work?" "I am a humble teacher of children," was the answer, "and if God recognizes my deeds, it can only be because I teach poor children without charge, and when I see that some make no progress, I feed them from the little store that I have, and encourage them by kind words." (Ta'anit 24,a).

It is the work of the humble, in which true Jewish charity expresses itself. Ferdinand Peck, a tinner in Vienna, left his estate, valued at 100,000 crowns, as a fund for the aid of mechanics trained under the auspices of the Vienna society for the encouragement of mechanical trades amongst Jews. Felicie Ploo of Prague, an old maid, who had denied herself all comfort in life, left upon

her death, 30,000 crowns, as a stipendiary fund for poor Jewish students to perpetuate the memory of her brother, a government's official. America heads the list of Jewish charities in the size of the amounts donated. Mr. Max Bamberger, of Philadelphia, left legacies totaling $652,162. Of charitable institutions, may be mentioned the addition to the National Jewish Hospital for consumptives in Denver, dedicated October 27. The new building of the Marx Nathan Orphan Home in Chicago, a welcome sign of the awakening of the orthodox community to the needs of modern methods, was dedicated November 27. The relatively small community of Los Angeles, dedicated a wonderful group of buildings on a ten acre plot for its orphan home, November 28. The New York Jewish community, which leads all Jewish communities of the world, present and past in all activities, laid the corner stone for the new Montefiore Home for Invalids, October 27th. The building is estimated to cost two millions of dollars. The Hecht Memorial Nurses Home in Baltimore was opened December 1. Nor are the spiritual needs of the community neglected. Mr. and Mrs. Jacob H. Schiff donated $180,000 out of the $250,000 needed for the Y. M. H. A. of New York. At the convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, held at Cincinnati, approximately $159,600 were subscribed for the needs of the Hebrew Union College. Mr. Schiff, the prince of givers, donated $50,000 to the Jewish Publication Society for the publication of the new English Bible, and 100,000 marks for a charitable fund, created in memory of his sister, Adelheid Geiger,

of Frankfurt-am-Main. For the benefit of those who believe that the east of Europe consists merely of beggars, it is worth while quoting that Mrs. Konitz of Odessa left two millions of francs for the poor of Kissingen, and Moses Schlefer, of Czernowitz, left 500,000 crowns, one-half of which is to be devoted to education and the other to the erection of cheap lodgings. It seems particularly worth while to note donations made by people, while they are living. Rudolph Mosse, the well known publisher of Berlin, gave on his seventieth birthday millions for public causes, of which one million of marks to the city of Berlin, and 1,250,000 marks to the pension fund for the employees of his establishments, besides numerous other smaller bequests. Mr. Edward J. Weinmann of Aussig, Bohemia, celebrated his sixtieth birthday, with the donation of 300,000 crowns, and Mr. A. H. Reich of Lemberg, his fiftieth birthday with the donation of 100,000 crowns. As specimens of the public spiritedness of Jews in general affairs, two donations of Nuremberg may be noticed. Max Pickert left 300,000 marks and Michael Kohn 910,000 marks to the city. The city of Nuremberg fought hard against the first settlement of Jews in 1850. It paid the city, as we see, to be defeated in the attempt to maintain the expulsion of 1499. A. Samson of Brussels, left a legacy of two millions of marks to the Prussian academy. Miss Henrietta Hertz of London gave 7500 pounds for scientific purposes, Henry Budge gave 250,000 francs for the University of Frankfurt; Prof. Morris Loeb of New York, donated one million dollars for public benefits, of which

500,000 were given to Harvard University; Max Michaelis bought forty-six pictures of Dutch masters for a national art gallery in South Africa. Robert von Fuchs bought a piece of ground for 200,000 crowns for the Art Museum in Prague, and in Russia, where the government tries to keep the Jews out of universities, M. Heilprin of Kiev gave the funds necessary for the equipment of a bacteriological laboratory for Prof. Bachmutiew in Moscow. The reader must understand that this list is only a partial enumeration of similar facts, and that the numerous small donations, which mean for their giver more than the hundreds of thousands for the millionaire, never become known beyond the local circles. The synagogue is indeed awake to the appeal of charity.

It is plainly impossible to do justice in a brief review, to the productions of Jewish literature, in all its branches. One year brings us still some of the old fashioned rabbinic literature, like the Responsa of Hirsch Spiro, a rabbi of Munkacs, which makes us feel as if we were living in the 16th century, and the entirely modern essays of Asher Guenzburg, of which the fourth volume has appeared. A Christian author, Erich Bischoff, writes on Cabbala. A German rabbi, M. Cahn, presents the claims of orthodoxy in modern shape. M. Goldstein draws a plan for a genuine Jewish "Nationalliteratur," and has the satisfaction of seeing Chamberlain's "Fundaments of the Nineteenth Century," appear in the tenth edition, having a sequel in the biased, though scholarly, work of Werner Sombart, on the Jews in political economy, which appears in English translation. Of works of fiction

one should mention the really brilliant drama of Arthur Schnitzler, "Professor Bernhardi." But even the field of fiction is in itself too extensive to allow a review of its tendencies and its literary merits. King Solomon is supposed to have said, that of making of books there is no end. One wonders what he would have said, if he had had to write the review, even of the comparatively small branch of the world's literature, dealing with Jews and Judaism, published in one single year. He could only repeat what he said before: "All things are full of weariness; man cannot utter it: the eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor the ear filled with hearing," and the reader who was kind enough to read this review to the end, will admit that King Solomon has earned the title of the "wisest of men.

THE YEAR 5674—A RESUME.*

"I, EVEN I am He that comforteth you. Who art thou that thou art afraid of man that shall die, and the son of man, which shall be made as grass . . . The captive exile shall speedily be loosed, and he shall not die and go down to Sheol. Neither shall his bread fail, for I am the Lord thy God, which stirreth up the sea that the waves thereof roar. The Lord of hosts is His name." (Isaiah, 50, 12-16.)

At this critical period, the world certainly needs the comfort of the prophet, and the Jew is made to feel that whatever ails him, is insignificant compared with the great problems of the world's moral future, which is now at stake, when our faith in the final fulfillment in the prophetic message that "swords shall be beaten into plowshares" is so severely shaken. Yet in accordance with our established tradition, we begin this review with some reference to the anti-semitic movement. Little as it may count today, we unfortunately may be pretty certain that next year's review will have to chronicle charges against the Jews from all sides. Whichever party will be defeated will blame the Jews and whatever ills are bound to follow the war, the Jews will have to bear the blame. Unfortunately we have to admit, that the sentiment of the American people is not generally friendly to the Jews. Just the smallness of the event, that we have to chronicle under this head,

*The American Israelite, September 17, 1914.

shows how widespread this antipathy is. Mr. Bagnell, a Methodist pastor of Brooklyn, attacks the Polish Jews as enemies of Christian civilization, and closes with an appeal to his audience to guard America against becoming the garbage barrel of Europe. Dr. Shaffer of Johnstown, Pa., in a journal of dentistry, speaking of the business end of the dental profession, claims that the three last words in the Jewish Bible, are "Get the money." A Kalamazoo, Mich., paper is provoked because the machinery of a bankrupt manufactory was sold and it bitterly attacks a director of the company for selling to a "Chicago Jew junk dealer." The budding intellectual flower of the nation, represented by the students of the Utica, N. Y., Free School established a "Kill Kyke Klan," and to cap the climax, a negro girl, advertising for housework in a Jacksonville, Fla. paper, warns Jews that they "Need not apply." When the whole civilized world was aroused by the mockery of justice in the ritual murder trial of Kiev, a writer in the London "Morning Post," attacked the Jews for their "pent-up hatred of Christianity, which according to the Talmud is the guide of all their lives." Mr. Ramsay, a member of the British House of Commons, said in a public address that "Every life laid down in South Africa was nothing but murder in the interest of Jewish capitalists." The inspector of the European schools of Calcutta ordered to debar all Jewish children from the government schools. It is certainly not to be wondered at that French clericalism, even under the British flag, receives immunity from the courts, and that the libel case

against M. Plamondon in Quebec, who repeated the charges of Drumont, was dismissed. Even from Italy we hear occasional facts, which prove that the no-Jew cry is a favorite weapon in political campaigns. The most noteworthy of these various incidents, is the attack made by a clerical nobleman on Marco Cassin, who was a candidate for the Chamber, and whose election, the clericals said, would be, "un' infamia, una vergogna troppo grande." In Germany, the home of modern antisemitism, we were surprised to note the decline of the movement as a political force. The two antisemitic parties of the Reichstag found it advisable to amalgamate. They now represent the formidable force of six votes. The leading antisemitic paper, the "Staatsbuerger Zeitung," after having been reduced from a daily to a weekly, has ceased publication entirely. This of course does not mean that the sentiment underlying the movement has disappeared. It exists even in such a body as the Boys' Scout organization. As a recognized political force, antisemitism continues in Austria, expecially in the Vienna city council, with its large antisemitic majority. The solons of the Vienna Rathaus, availed themselves of an opportunity to invite the ridicule of the whole world, when they ignored the Jewish poet Arthur Schnitzler, who had been given the Raimund prize, while at the same time a Christian author, who had received the same prize, was congratulated. International clericalism showed itself as implacable enemy in the discussion of the ritual murder question, on the occasion of the Kiev trial. Clerical papers all over the world, including France,

England, Italy, and even Australia, helped to foment prejudice by declaring emphatically that the Catholic church was bound by its ritual, which recognized victims of past ritual murders as saints, to accept this malicious libel as a fact.

In the United States, the only political action affecting the Jews, was the passage by the House of Representatives of the new immigration bill, which showed its regard for Jewish interest, by the insertion of a clause declaring Hebrew and Yiddish as sufficient in literary test. The bill, passed by the House, February 4th, did not go through the Senate, and owing to the complex political situation, will hardly have any chance of being submitted to the President. A resolution introduced by Mr. Chandler of New York, in the House of Representatives, to compel Roumania to live up to the stipulations of the treaty of Berlin, was no more than an expression of sympathy, as was also the resolution offered by Mr. Lewis in the Senate, October 23rd, to demand of Russia the withdrawal of the ritual murder charge against Mendel Beilis. The assurance, given by President Wilson to Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, that under no condition would he sign a treaty with Russia, which would not safeguard the right of the American Jews, is, under the present conditions in Europe, though highly valuable, merely academic.

Our internal conditions show a favorable development. The annual convention of Jewish farmers, held for the fifth time in New York, the eighth annual convention of the New York Kehillah, which finally received its articles of incorporation, the annual

conventions of the Union of Orthodox Congregations, and of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and finally the completion of the new Bible translation, show a gratifying progress in our communal life. Owing to a situation, which from the point of view of the lover of humanity is deplorable, but which as conditions are, means a great deal to the Jewish people, the fact that among the seventeen American sailors killed at Vera Cruz, there were two Jews, Meisenberg, of Chicago, and Frolichstein of Mobile, is bound to serve as a strong argument in case of future attacks on the patriotism of Jews. To the same class belongs the appointment of Henry Behrendt, chief of police of Lansing, Michigan, as United States marshall for the eastern district of that state. On the other hand, the participation of the Jews in the work of peace is represented in the reappointment of Mr. Oscar S. Straus, as member of the international court of arbitration at The Hague, unfortunately a mockery under the present conditions when within fifty miles from Mr. Carnegie's palace of peace, the mouth of the guns declares law. Highly gratifying as a victory over political intrigues, is the appointment of Mr. Paul M. Warburg, as member of the Federal Reserve Board. If the hopes for a normal development of commerce, expected from this board, are fulfilled, it will be a victory, greater than ever won on any battlefield. Unfortunately there is a drop of bitterness in this cup of joy. The execution in New York of three Jews as criminals of the lowest mercenary type, was a severe disappointment for our whole community.

Our neighbors in Canada have reason to rejoice at the election of Messrs. Blumenthal and Rubinstein as aldermen of the city of Montreal, and the fact that the former was for a time acting mayor, gives to this local event a national significance. The English House of Commons briefly discussed the Roumanian situation. Sir J. D. Rees interpellated the government what action England as a signatory power of the Berlin treaty intended to take in order to guard the rights of religious minorities. The answer of the representative of the foreign office was evasive. He declared that England would remind the Balkan states of their duties. but he also admitted that the European powers are not in harmony. In the light of subsequent events we can see that this answer is entirely without value, for the British foreign office had all reasons not to disturb the conditions in this storm area. An attempt, made to change the election day from Saturday, which was fathered by Mr. Lionel de Rothschild, is, at least from this distance, of no great significance. Rather depressing is the attack, made by Mr. Rowland Hunt, M. P., on the premier for having "made a gambling Jew lord Chief Justice of England," March 24. Sir Rufus Isaacs, who was in this way complimented, was in accordance with tradition raised to the peerage, but there is hardly any doubt but that a similar sentiment prevails in large circles, and not merely within the conservative party against which the Jewish M. P., Mr. B. S. Strauss, used Mr. Hunt's remark as a weapon.

The question of the freedom of foreign Jews to travel in Russia was broached by the French League of the

Rights of Man in a petition to the premier. The latter, as we can easily understand now, could not possibly embarass the ally of the French nation, and therefore limited himself to the expression of sympathy with this idea, which, he declared, might be taken up at a more opportune time. The French Chamber now has seven Jewish members, among whom for the first time is a Russian immigrant Jew, M. Bokanowski, while three former members, the two brothers Reinach, and M. Javal, were defeated. An unprecedented honor was the election of Henri Bergson as member of the Academy. It is an honor, won by the son of an immigrant Polish Jew, who, however, is not in the habit of over-emphasizing his Jewish attachment. This brilliant picture is marred by a small incident. The hospital board, on which Senator Paul Strauss has a seat, issued an order, to prohibit the admission of foreigners as internes, which is directed against Russian Jews, though naturally they are not named.

From Italy we can report brilliant successes in political life by the election of sixteen Jews as members of the Chamber, and the appointment of four others as members of the Senate. In both houses the number of Jewish members is way above their proportion in the population. Very gratifying is the large number of Jews who were decorated for bravery in the Tripolitan campaign. The religious and communal life of the Italian Jews has for years shown a rapid decline. It is therefore an encouraging sign that at a convention, held at Rome, May 11-12, a union of Italian congregations was formed. There seems to be even a fear of Jewish clericalism, for socialist

members interpellated the government on a decision, rendered by the authorities of Verona, who declared the payment of taxes to the Jewish community compulsory for every Jew. In this respect the legal condition of Italian congregations is in a chaotic state, resulting from the laws, prevailing in the various territories previous to the establishment of the present kingdom of Italy.

The states of northern Europe, where the Jews enjoy perfect freedom, showed during the last year nothing of any consequence, but even there a fear of an undue increase of the Jewish population seems to prevail. Both Sweden and Denmark enacted laws, one imposing a special tax on Russian immigrants, and the other prohibiting peddling, which in each instance are aimed against Russian refugees. In Denmark a society was formed to protect the Jews against arbitrary expulsion. For Holland, with its comparatively large Jewish population, it is worth while recording that Prof. Joseph Jitta was appointed a member of the council of state, succeeding in this capacity the late minister Asser.

The present war may have a very important effect on the position of the Jews of Germany. Year after year complaints were voiced in the Reichstag about the discriminations against the Jews in the army. In the present war it would seem natural that some Jews will distinguish themselves, and thus obtain the rank of officer, which is being persistently denied to them in times of peace. On the other hand, it may be the case that the success of the German army will give to men like the generals von Kleist, and Liebert

the right to claim that the present German army has shown itself so efficient, that it would be sheer temerity to tamper with its composition, especially in the light of the poor showing made by both France and Austria, where Jews hold prominent positions in the army. This, the future will have to decide. Meantime we have the statement of the minister of war, von Falkenhayn, who declared in the Reichstag, May 8th, that the exclusion of Jews from commissions in the army, was clearly unconstitutional, and was contrary to the will of the Kaiser, and the wishes of the war department. Herr von Falkenhayn made these statements in an unguarded moment, for he corrected his remarks in the records, substituting the word "seems" unconstitutional, for "is." A real gain for the Jews, though not significant as to numbers, is the new naturalization law, passed November 30th, which makes all ministers of religion naturalized citizens, by force of their election to office. The persecution of foreign Jews began in 1885 with the digging up of a law of 1847, requiring for the election of a foreign Jew to a congregational office, the previous permission of the minister of the interior. The general policy with regard to foreign Jews will not be affected by this new law.

The government of Saxony began a wholesale expulsion of foreign Jews employed as mechanics, clerks, and domestic servants. The Prussian department of education issued restrictions on foreign students at Prussian universities, which, while not naming Russian Jews, is practically aimed at them. The department of the interior expelled hundreds of

honest Jewish workingmen as Poles, and quite lately we heard that all foreign Jews in the mining districts of Westphalia and Rhenish Prussia received the order of expulsion. In the diet of Bavaria Herr Loeweneck clearly stated that the new naturalization law, while making a small concession, by allowing foreign Jews to be ministers, will work a great hardship on them. The former law left naturalization entirely in the hands of the states. The present law requires that every naturalization be submitted to every state in the federation, which has the right to veto it. This law, whether intended so or not, has practically worked against the naturalization of every Jew. The state's authorities, Prussia especially, are by no means friendly. Oscar Cassel interpellated in the Prussian diet the minister on a fire insurance society, which had refused an expert, named by a company, previously agreed upon by the contesting parties for settling a claim. The expert named was a Jew, and the fire insurance company refused to accept him on the plea that a Jew would not render a fair decision in a case in which another Jew was involved. The minister, to whom the matter was referred, refused to intercede. The same spirit animated an order of a provincial school superintendent, who would not allow a Jewish teacher, for years employed at a school in West Prussia, to teach German or history.

In the smaller states, the old system of regulating congregational affairs by the government, continues. Bavaria is here in the lead. The government faces a very difficult problem. The law on which the organi-

zation of Jewish congregations rests was issued in 1813. It is absolutely antiquated, but the religious dissension in the Jewish congregations renders it impossible to find a working basis for a new law. The other alternative, a system which would separate state and church, is not favored by the government, and has only a small number of supporters in the overwhelmingly clerical diet. The opposition by liberal members to a new school law, which makes attendance at religious exercises compulsory for the pupils, was ignored by the minister. The appropriation for religious instruction was opposed in the city council of Munich by liberals and socialists, but voted by the clericals. An antisemitic attack in the diet on the government for awarding an advertising contract to the Jewish firm of Rudolph Mosse, was evasively answered by the minister, who, following the example of Prussia, introduced restrictions on the so-called foreign (which means Russian Jewish) students at the universities. The religious needs of the congregations are, however, an object of the care of the government, not merely in Bavaria, but in all the smaller states of Germany. The synod of the Grandduchy of Baden recommends to the rabbis that they should not insist on their rights in cases of marriage, when the contracting parties desire an orthodox instead of a liberal minister. The Landesgemeinderat of Oldenburg goes back to the models of eighty years ago by issuing regulations how to maintain decorum in the services. There was a time when the small German principalities issued such regulations affecting all details of the service. The economic development

of the last years played havoc with these conditions. The Grandduchy of Mecklenburg-Strelitz had to unite all the Jews of the state into one congregation, which numbers barely forty families. The diet of Saxony again discussed the re-enactment of the prohibition of Shehitah, but the minister expressed his satisfaction with the present system, provided the existing restrictions would be maintained.

The status of the Roumanian Jews formed the subject of an interpellation in both Parliaments of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. In each instance the minister replied that the matter was an internal affair of Roumania, evidently desirous to spare the susceptibilities of a country, whose good will Austria needed very badly, in view of the threatening complications. Various important complaints were presented in the Austrian Reichsrat. The city council of Vienna refuses to appoint Jews as principals of schools, having a majority of Jewish pupils, as the law requires. Jewish internes are discriminated against and insulted in hospitals, subsidized from public funds, and liberally endowed by Jewish benefactors. The provincial authorities of Styria advertised a contract for a public building with the clause that the bids of Jewish firms would not be considered. An important subject for discussion in various public bodies, was the so-called Waidhofen platform, a resolution adopted by German student fraternities, some twelve years ago, which declares that inasmuch as the Jew does not know the sentiment of personal honor, no member of such a fraternity will challenge a Jew to a duel, or accept his challenge. The in-

terpellation of member Reizes in the Reichsrat stated correctly that officers in the reserve, who are at the same time members of such a fraternity, are in such case violating their military duty, which demands that they treat everyone, wearing the emperor's uniform, as their equal. The situation of Galicia was also repeatedly the subject of an interpellation. A new electoral law, agreed upon by the two contending parties, the Poles and the Ruthenians, deprives the Jews of the chance of proper representation in the diet. The arbitrariness of the officials, reminiscent of good old Polish times, has often a ludicrous aspect, as is the case with the order of the principal of a Gymnasium, that the students must not speak Yiddish among themselves. Otherwise the situation of the Galician Jews is quite serious, owing to the continuance of the boycott movement, which is fostered by the powerful clerical party in a daily paper, which they control. The animosity went so far that Nahum Sokolov, the Hebrew publicist, was prevented from giving an address in Cracow on the self-protection of the Jews. The chauvinistic attitude of the Slavic races of Austria, who charge the Jews with Germanizing activity, does not seem justified. The last Jewish school in Bohemia was closed this year. It was the only one that was left of nearly one hnudred that existed, when the school law of 1868 went into effect. These Jewish schools were established for the sake of giving to children an efficient German training. They were gradually closed, because the Jews yielded to the Slavic sentiment which condemned these institutions. Of per-

sonal notes it is worth while recording that the Jew Ladislaus Fejer was appointed head of a department in the Hungarian ministry of the interior.

The resignation of Kokowzew as premier of Russia, and the appointment of Goremykin as his successor, February 12th, has, if anything, resulted in increased persecution of the Jews. Their treatment is but a part of the autocratic system, expressed in the following figures. During the last year 374 newspapers were fined a total of 139,655 roubles; 226 issues were suppressed by the censor; 63 editors had to be dismissed, and 20 papers were suspended. One must not forget that this was done under the existing law, proclaiming freedom of press. To Jews it is interesting to note that most of these punishments were decreed in consequence of the Beilis trial. The exposure of corruption in the government is the greatest crime in the dominion of the Czar. Eight respectable Jews of the border town, Zvonitz, were sent to Siberia for five years, because they had exposed a government official, who made it his business to blackmail and rob emigrants, whom he smuggled across the border. While defrauding his own government, he was treated with great consideration, because he helped to arrest political offenders, trying to escape from the country. The general situation of the Jews is presented in some of the following figures. 14,605 petitions were presented to the Czar by Jewish parents, desiring to bring their children into public schools, 1,398,300 roubles were collected as fines from Jews for dodging military service, but at the same time 35,000 Jews were drafted into the army, while according to their

percentage, there ought not to have been more than 26,000. The minister refused to entertain a petition, presented to him by a nationalistic society, to exclude Jews from the army as a treacherous element, but the Jew, Abramowitz, the oldest employee of the Arsenal in St. Petersburg, who had served for nearly sixty years, was excluded from a banquet, given at the bicentenary of this institution.

The greatest misery from which the Jews of Russia suffer, is the continued restriction on education. The latest move in this line was a new order issued by the minister, which requires that instead of the merit system, regulating the filling of vacancies for Jewish students, the system of casting lots was introduced which reduces the number of admissions, because the lot decides on those admitted to examination, and the places left open by the failure of Jewish students to pass examinations, are either filled by Christians or not filled at all. In addition, the exclusion of foreign students from German universities affects the Russian Jews, against whom it is aimed. Of 510 Russian students at the University of Berlin, 499 were Jews. The Russian Jewish culture society, Mefize Haskalah, celebrated its fiftieth anniversary, January 4th, under very sad auspices. Its report stated that the government places obstacles in its way, instead of encouraging its work. It prohibited the opening of a museum in Kiev, the holding of popular lectures, and the attendance of Jewish teachers at the national educational congress in St. Petersburg. The action of the police of Wilna does not lack an element of humor. Posters announcing that the

illustrious Prof. Herman Cohen of Berlin, would lecture on the "Ethical Fundaments of the Jewish Religion," had to be removed. The Wilna police does not allow the people of the city to know that a Jew may be an illustrious professor, and that Judaism has ethical fundaments. An instance of the same brutality is the persecution of the Zionist movement. Nine Zionists in Warsaw were sentenced partly to long terms in prison, partly to exile in Siberia, for belonging to a prohibited society. A Jew who sang "Hatikvah" on a boat, sailing from Odessa, was taken off, promptly tried and sentenced to five days in jail.

Another series of persecutions began with an order of the minister of justice, which prohibits the holding, renting, and administering of real estate by Jews outside of the Pale. In addition the minister of commerce prohibited the participation of Jews in stock companies, that control real estate and the owning of stock in banks, interested in any transaction, involving real estate. As an instance, illustrating the effect of this order, the case of the government of Charkov may be cited, where fifty coal mines, giving employment to 6,000 hands, had to shut down. Various organizations of merchants called on the premier and on the minister of commerce, warning against the execution of this order as ruinous to Russian interests. Even the leading antisemitic publicist, Prince Meshtcherski, joined in this protest. With the outbreak of hostilities this order was indeed suspended. On the other hand, new restrictions on Jewish lawyers were enforced by the minister of justice, and the old restrictions on the right of residence, were carried

out with a fiendish cruelty, which has hardly its equal anywhere in history. Five thousand families of artisans were expelled from Kiev, because their certificates of apprenticeship were not in order. A blacksmith, who had for forty years worked at his trade in a village of the government of Kiev, was expelled, because by attending the wedding of a relative, he had forfeited his right of residence in a village, which a Jew loses if he is absent for three days. A liberal member of the Duma quoted the case of a Jew, who was working for a railroad, and whose family was exiled after its supporter had been killed in a railroad accident, while on duty. Another Jew living in Siberia, where he had been originally exiled as a criminal, was expelled when an amnesty was granted. As a criminal he possessed the right of residence, and as a reputable citizen, he lost it. It is one of the whims of Nemesis, that George Brandes, who refused to register as a Jew, was not permitted to visit St. Petersburg. The saddest effect of all these persecutions is the weakening of Jewish conscience. The apostacies increased to an alarming degree. A pastor in Finland reported at a conference that not a day passes without one or more Jews calling on him, and wishing to be received into the Protestant church. The government had to adopt measures against these converts, most of whom merely wish to evade the restrictions imposed on the Jews.

The most important, and at the same time most gratifying event, was the trial of Mendel Beilis for ritual murder, which resulted in his acquittal, November 10th. This verdict of the jury was a severe

defeat for the government. The latter felt it as such and tried to recover it by a new stupidity. It indicted the Jew, Ephraim Pashkoff, also in Kiev, whose little son had been murdered under the charge that he had killed a Christian child, claiming afterwards that it was his own son who had ben killed. The charge was trumped up with such stupidity, that it could no more be maintained than that against Beilis. The only difference was that Pashkoff was fortunate enough to escape with a few weeks of imprisonment, while Beilis was tortured for two and a half years in the Czar's dungeons. The antisemites of course, will not admit their defeat. "Nowoye Wremya" opens a subscription for a monument in memory of Andrew Yushzinsky "tortured to death by Jewish fanatics." Wera Tcheburiak sues the journalist Brazul-Brashofsky, who first exposed her as the perpetrator, or instigator of the crime, for malicious libel. She could not obtain a verdict, but she is under the protection of the government, which refuses to indict her. The priest Pranaitis, who testified for the prosecution in the Beilis trial was decorated with the Order of Stanislaus. The Jew, Lewik, a professional informer, discharged from the secret police, with which he was once connected, offers testimony to the fact of ritual murder, and is rewarded with a passport, giving him unrestricted right of residence in the whole Russian empire, a privilege, denied to the most respectable Jews. At a bar examination the question is asked, how to conduct an examination in the case of a child that was found murdered on the Eve of Passover. A Saint Gabriel, the hero of one

of those fictitious martyrdoms, of which both Greek and Roman Catholic churches possess a large supply, all at once becomes dissatisfied with his resting place in Sluzk, where he had been comfortably located for 250 years, and demands, in a vision, that his bones be transferred to Kiev. The Jews live in terror, fearing that at any moment the mob might be let loose against them. On the other hand, a lecture on hypnotism by a medical student is prohibited because he had explained some of the antisemitic testimony in ritual murder trials as suggested by hypnotists. The watchfulness of the Russian authorities extends even to the Orient. The Russian consul in Jaffa had the impudence to demand from the chief rabbi that he prohibit a protest meeting against the Kiev trial. Prof. Troitzki of the University of Kiev, the medical expert, who had testified against the ritual murder theory, and Kasatchenko, the police official who testified that a letter, supposed to have been written by Beilis to his wife, in which he admitted his guilt, was a forgery, were dismissed from service. The same was the fate of Judge Yankowsky, who conducted the trial of Pashkoff, because he had failed to find evidence, convicting the innocent Jew. Margolin, one of Beilis' attorneys, was disbarred for non-professional conduct. Twenty-five lawyers, among whom seven Jews, were sentenced to terms of imprisonment, ranging from six to eight months, for signing a protest, in which the procedure of the court of Kiev was condemned. The socialist members interpellated the government, why all papers and objects, introduced as evidence in the

Beilis trial, had been destroyed. The minister of justice logically ignored the question. He knew that the interpellants knew the reason anyhow. The most remarkable condemnation of this farce came from antisemitic ranks. Shulgin, the editor of an antisemitic paper, was sentenced to three months imprisonment for his severe arraignment of the government's procedure in the Beilis trial. Very disheartening are the reports from Poland, where several Jews were murdered by Polish boycotters, because they ignored the notice served on them that they leave the town. The only ray of light is that a motion in the Duma to grant to the Jews equal rights, received fifty-two votes, and the remarkable address delivered by Prof. Niekrassoff, which closed with a stirring appeal to the Jews, not to give up the hope in the future of the Russian people. The latest announcement of the Czar, that he would give to the Jews legal equality, is of course not taken seriously by anyone acquainted with the course of the Russian history since 1881.

The great territorial changes which were the results of the wars which disrupted the Turkish empire, had considerable effect on the condition of the historic Jewish communities, living in the former Turkish territories from times immemorial, but in the majority composed of the descendants of the refugees from the Spanish Inquisition, who found protection under the milder scepter of Islam, from the cruelty of Christians. Most favorably affected were the Jews of Servia. They remain, as they were under Turkish rule, exempt from the Sunday law. The synagogs,

destroyed during the war, will be rebuilt at the expense of the state, and the sympathy of the population is shown in the election of the first Jew to the city council of Belgrade. As far as known, the condition of the Jews in Turkey proper has not been changed: Three Jews, instead of four, were returned to Parliament, the one seat lost being that of Salonica, which became annexed to Greece. Some Jews were appointed to high offices under the government, while Emanuel Carasso, member of Parliament for Constantinople, declined the seat in the Senate offered to him. Very unsatisfactory are the internal conditions. It seems impossible to organize the Jewish communities on the basis of the existing law. Turkey in Europe has certainly become Europeanized to some extent, for Sheriff Pasha holds the Jews responsible for all the trouble, created by the Young Turks, and even in Asiatic Turkey, as shall be noticed under the head of "Zionism," antisemitism begins to thrive. Of Bulgaria, little remains to be said. The King and some high officials, including the Metropolitan of Sophia, showed their sympathy with the Jews in the ritual murder trial at Kiev. In Greece, however, the signs of the times are rather ill-foreboding. The wanton murder of two Jews in Salonica on Christmas Eve as a sort of special holiday entertainment, was inconvenient to the authorities, but the perpetrators have not been arrested. This may be accidental, but there can be no doubt as to the unfriendly attitude of the Greek officials. The Salonica chief of police demands that the Jews give up the traditional "Fez," but on the other hand, the police could not prevent an attack

on a Jewish funeral in Brussa. The Greek press of Salonica is very hostile, and the best proof of its spirit is the malicious slander, that the Jews had sent a committee to M. Caillaux, then French minister of finance, now an international celebrity as the husband of Madame Caillaux, requesting his support for the scheme of a Jewish republic to be established at Salonica. The attitude of the clergy is very unfriendly. The Greek patriarch of Constantinople, asked by the chief rabbi to make a statement against the ritual murder charge, ignored the request. Very insignificant, when compared with these facts, are such small incidents as the naming of a street in Janina for Max Nordau, or the promise of the minister of education to establish a chair for Jewish literature at the University of Athens.

While in Greece the government is at least trying to win the sympathy of civilized Europe by its attitude to the Jews, the government of Roumania is entirely indifferent to the voice of civilization. During the war there appeared occasionally a ray of hope. Take Jonescu, the minister of the interior, said to a reporter that it was the intention of the government, to recognize the equality of the Jews, living in the territory annexed from Bulgaria, and to grant similar rights to all Jews who had served in the last war. But at a meeting held at Bucharest this project was denounced as treason, and the King, in a reply to a petition from Jews, merely had to say that he sympathized with their situation, but he was bound to act as a constitutional monarch. The duties of a constitutional monarch were clearly defined by the

Parliament, which introduced new restrictions on the business of the Jews in the good old style of restricting the right of being sworn stock brokers, to "Roumanian citizens." The most cruel piece of legislation was a clause, restricting pensions to widows and orphans of soldiers, who were killed in action, to Roumanian citizens. The Jews in the newly annexed district were not made citizens, and the promise to the soldiers was totally forgotten. At the dedication of a synagog of Silistria, which before the war was Bulgarian, the sub-prefect made an address in which he demanded of the Jews to become Roumanian patriots, but warned them against cherishing any illusions. The only favorable sign is a statement made by Istrati, former minister of education, who denounced in the Chamber the narrow policy of the government, which excludes foreigners from public schools, while other enlightened governments use the public schools as means of promoting patriotic sentiments. The petition of the Roumanian Jews, who held public protest meetings, interpellations in the parliaments of Austria, Hungary, and England, and an action by the Joint Committee representing the Anglo-Jewish Association, and the Deputies of British Jews, had no results. These steps did not have even any effect in checking acts of lawlessness including several wanton murders, and when in the case of a riot the police wounded some of the rioters, the minister in reply to an interpellation, declared he would investigate the matter, but did not even find it necessary to say one word of condemnation against the law breakers.

With the annexation of Tripoli by Italy, and the occupation of Morocco by France, the whole of the North-African coast passed under European control, which is quite a welcome relief, especially for the Jews of Morocco. The French authorities seemed to plan the same action that they took in Tunis. Only the proteges of foreign powers will pass under French jurisdiction, while the bulk of the native Jews will remain in their present status. The Jews of Fez, who suffered very heavily during the war, will receive one million of francs as indemnity, but strange to say, the Jews do not seem to feel happy under the new government. They are evidently, not only Jews, but also Orientals. A similar complaint is heard from Tripoli, with regard to the Italian officials. Spain seems to have the desire of winning the sympathy of Jews in her North-African possessions. Prof A. S. Yahuda, of the Berlin Lehranstalt, was invited to deliver a course of lectures at the University of Madrid, and on this occasion was signally honored. People who know Spain well declare, however, that a settlement of the Jews in Spain on a large scale can hardly be expected, owing to the hostile attitude of the population.

For Zionism the year began with very promising events. The railroad from Haifa to Akko was opened, and a new harbor planned, which would greatly benefit the colonies of Judaea. A visit of Baron Edmond de Rothschild, and a permit given to him to carry on excavations, were signs of progress. On the other hand, however, hostilities of the native population seem to grow. Several Jewish guards

were killed by hostile Arabs, and an Arabic paper, published in Jaffa, carries on a campaign of relentless hostility. The Sultan refused to grant the sale of a large tract of government's land to Baron de Rothschild, and according to the best information obtainable the abrogation of the so-called red ticket is a mere formality, while the prohibition of immigration and of acquisition of real estate, is enforced more strictly than was done for the last few years. Very unfortunate was the contention in the board of the Haifa Polytechnic, between Zionists and their opponents, which for a while seemed to have been settled, when Mr. Jacob H. Schiff came forward with a strong denunciation of the Zionist policy, so that for the present at least, the whole scheme is abandoned. A very regrettable incident was the protest published by representative Jews of Germany against the Zionist movement. Whatever the provocation may have been, the publication of the protest in the daily papers, could hardly create a favorable opinion in the non-Jewish world. The great orthodox congress planned for Frankfort in August, had naturally to be abandoned on account of the war. The agitation of the Agudath Israel in America had no tangible effect. The movement, as far as it can be judged, starts from conditions exclusively typical of Germany, if not of Frankfort, and is not at all applicable to the situation in Russia and Poland, to say nothing of the Orient. Reform did not make any noticeable progress either. Attempts to start reform congregations in Birmingham and in Johannesburg may be indicative of a progressive movement in England and her colonies. A

rather unique occurrence is the action of the soldiers in Rostov on the Don, who in typically military fashion brought an organ into the synagog, regardless of the protest of the rabbi.

"Israel may be asleep in religious duties," says the Midrash, "but it is awake to matters of charity." Owing to the great number of cases that would have to be reported under this head, only a few prominent instances can be quoted. They are chosen as remarkable on account of the large sums given, or because they show the broadness of the donor, and the widespread nature of Jewish charity. America, heads the list as always. The largest gift was that of Benjamin Altman, whose art collection, estimated to be worth twenty million dollars, was given to the city of New York. Other individual bequests made in his will like that of $100,000 to Mt. Sinai Hospital, would already be worthy of note. The names, regularly appearing in this connection, that of Jacob H. Schiff, who gave $500,000 for a business college, and of Julius Rosenwald, who gave $250,000 to the Associated Charities of Chicago, in addition to half a dozen or more gifts of $25,000 each, to Young Men's Christian Associations of various cities, one would expect in any annual report. The dedication of the Montefiore Home for Chronic Invalids, in New York, erected at a cost of nearly two millions of dollars, is another brilliant testimony to the generosity of the New York community. According to the fine remark of the Talmud, (Ta'anit 21, a), that not the merits of the learned rabbi, but of the plain laborer, who did acts of charity, saved the city, we

must quote the case of Mrs. Israel Marks, the widow of a junk dealer in New Brunswick, N. J., who left $100,000 to charity. Nearest to the case of Benjamin Altman comes the gift of Count Isaac de Camondo of Paris, who left his art collection, valued at nearly eight millions of francs, to the Louvre. A bequest of 100,000 marks for art purposes was made by Wilhelm von Gerngross in Nuremberg. Mrs. Isaac Belilios of Howra, East India, gave to the city her mansion with a plot of fifty acres, and property worth $1,670,000 for a public library. The ghetto used to say; "near a golden carriage, you will find a golden tag." Ignatz Sichel, head clerk of the Rothschild house of Frankfort, left a bequest of one million of marks for the education of Jewish boys. But even from the lands of oppression and misery come reports of remarkable generosity. Schaje Berlin gave to the Jewish community of Riga 300,000 roubles for a hospital. Isaac M. Schlesinger of Tchita, in eastern Siberia, bought 6,000 dunham of land in Palestine, for which he paid 100,000 roubles. Mendel Tittinger, of Czernowitz, left 2,000,000 of crowns to Jewish charities. Israel's heart is awake indeed.

THE YEAR 5675—A RESUME.*

"PUT, O Lord, Thy fear over all Thy works, and Thy dread over all that Thou hast created, so that all Thy works shall fear Thee, and all Thy creatures shall worship Thee, and all shall form one bond of fellowship to do Thy will with a perfect heart."

Thus runs our traditional New Year's prayer, dating probably from a time when some great leader in Israel found it necessary to proclaim the ideal of a universal religion, and to protest against a narrow nationalistic conception of Judaism. Was there ever a time in the world's history when mankind was more urgently in need of this lesson than this present moment? Hardly. It is a noble testimony to Israel's undying idealism that, interpreting the New Year as a symbol of the beginning of life, it celebrated it proclaiming God as the King of the universe, and all mankind, His Children, as one family. With more intensity than ever before these prayers will be uttered from Jewish lips all over the world. Many fathers, trembling for the lives of their sons at the battlefront, many mothers distracted by hope and fear, many wives whose future may be decided at the moment of the service "by the arrow that flieth by day, or the pestilence that walketh in darkness" will cry out from the depth of their heart: "Let all nations form one brotherhood to worship Thee with a perfect heart, Father of Peace."

*The American Israelite, September 9, 1915.

In last year's review, the following passage occurred: "We unfortunately may be pretty certain that next year's review will have to chronicle charges against the Jews from all sides. Whichever party will be defeated, will blame the Jews, and whatever ills are bound to follow the war, the Jews will have to bear the blame for it."

To what extent has this prediction come true? Hamilton Fyfe, writing in "Daily Mail" says, "The Russian Jews are against the war because contractors have little chance to do any business, as supplies are furnished by the Zemstvos." Quite different is the view of "Bystander." This London paper declares that the Jews are responsible for the war, because, through it, they expect to make money, which they will use for the advancement of their race, not caring how many of "us or any other people" are being killed. So you have your choice of holding the Jews responsible either for war or peace. They are always responsible for just the thing that you don't happen to like. You will also have your choice as to which side in the war the Jews favor. The "North Star" of Darlington claims that a corrupt cosmopolitan gang of Jewish financiers is responsible for Turkey's entry into the war. The "New Witness" seconds the motion and claims that "Patriotism is in the very nature of things, a quality that the race of Mr. Zangwill has evidently lost." We know now, that the Jews are cosmopolitan, and care for their race only. Our conviction, however, is shaken by the "Ilkestone Pioneer," a Derbyshire paper, which declares that the German Jews, living in England,

are such German jingoes that they wish to help the Kaiser, and incidentally, they wish to make money also, because this is their only creed. In exactly the same way, Mr. Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the Germanized Englishman, claims that Lord Burnham, formerly Edward Levy, goaded the English into war because it was calculated to help the circulation of the "Telegraph" and to make people forget Lord Burnham's original name. Of quite the opposite opinion is our own Thomas A. Edison, who declared in an interview that the Jews of Germany caused the war, because they control the military gang which controls the country. This latter opinion seems to be the more popular view of the English press. While Thomas Edison may have had his rival, the lately deceased Emil Rathenau, in mind, the London "Times" which since the days of the Anglo-Russian entente has evolved into an ally of "Nowoye Wremya." claims that Albert Ballin is the real Kaiser, and Lord Hylton appropriates this information about "The most prominent Jewish business man of Germany" in an address, delivered in the House of Lords. Welschinger of the Institute of France knows of a few accomplices of Ballin, naming in addition to the president of the Hamburg America Line, Maximilian Harden and Dernburg. Harden is an apostate with strongly anti-Jewish leanings, and Dernburg, the grandson of a baptized Jew, even by race only a half-Jew. Nevertheless various English papers appropriate this discovery, and the "Manchester Dispatch" claims that "The foreign Jews, instead of rallying around the flag that has given them an asylum, spread pro-German arguments."

The King of England said in a public letter to a Jew who has four sons in the army, that "He thoroughly appreciates the loyalty which they share with so many thousands of others of the Jewish persuasion in the United Kingdom." Even outside of the United Kingdom, the British cause has received support. Five hundred Palestinian refugees who are Russian subjects formed a Jewish battalion in Alexandria. Yet an officer returning from the front to London on a visit, when asked at his club by a man of Jewish descent about war news, replied "D—— your impertinence. How dare you, a German, ask a British Officer about war news?" At a recruiting station in London, Jewish volunteers were refused because of the existence of prejudice against them among other soldiers. While in England Jews are supposed to be Germans, antisemitic papers in Germany demand of the government to disavow Dernburg, who was on a campaign in America trying to enlist the sympathies of the American people for Germany, because, on account of his descent he has no right to represent Germany. The "Koelnische Zeitung," not directly an antisemitic paper, is indignant at the British Jews of German descent as "interlopers, reminding us of the times of the Autodafé." One should imagine that the fugitives from the Autodafé should be considered heroes by a paper which always fought ultramontanism. Full-blooded antisemitic papers like "Hammer" spread the lie that a Jewish professor, and the daughter of a Jewish physician in Freiburg i. B., fairly worshiped French prisoners. "Hessische Landeszeitung" again prefers to present

the cosmopolitan Jew, insinuating that the Italian premier, Sonnino, being a Jew, must have gotten a good price for the declaration of war by Italy. Sonnino by the way, is a Protestant, the son of an English woman, though of a Jewish father. With less concern about the actual facts, the same class of papers claimed that the Italian poet, Gabriel D'Annunzio, the war agitator, was the son of a Polish Jew named Rapaport. The story is made out of whole cloth.

It used to be my practice to devote the first chapter of my annual review to a presentation of the development of antisemitism. This year this practice shall be abandoned. It may be that we are on the threshold of Messianic times. The Talmud (Sanhedrin, 98 a) says that the Messiah will not come unless all mankind is good or all mankind is bad. It seems that the latter alternative is about to be realized. There is hardly any country from which we have no antisemitic movement to report, and all communal, especially cultural activities having ceased, we might refer to antisemitism in connection with every country. We might also say with reference to Jewish precedents, (Tosafot, Ta'anit, 21, b. Shulhan Aruk, Orah Hayyim, 576, 3) that we have to bear our share in the troubles of the outside world, even if we should not personally be concerned in it. Our growing community of Israel in America has such a variety of activities that a year's review furnishes a great deal of material. We might discuss economic life, presented at such gatherings as that of the Jewish farmers, of the Arbeiter Verband, of the Jewish Socialist Party, or the religious problems, discussed by

the Union of Orthodox congregations, the Mizrachi Convention, the New York Kehillah, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and the activities of the various fraternal organizations amongst which this year the Constitutional Grand Lodge of the Independent Order B'ne B'rith, as an event which occurs only once in five years, would especially deserve more exhaustive treatment. Unfortunately the problems presented by the War are too pressing to allow us to devote attention to the problems of normal times. However, we can not lose sight completely of our civic progress. At the national elections of last fall, six Jews were returned to the House of Representatives, not a very large number, probably way below our proportion in the population, and certainly insignificant in comparison with the political achievements of the Jews in England and Italy, but at any rate a record of our participation in public life. A matter of sad privilege is the fact that of two sailors killed when the United States Troops landed at Cape Haitien, July 29, one William Gompers, was a Jew, bringing back to us the memory of last year's review, when we chronicled the death of two Jewish soldiers at Vera Cruz. Of important distinctions won by individual Jews, we should not forget the appointment of Samuel Alschuler as president of the newly created Deep Waterway Commission, a body of great national importance, though he soon afterwards resigned, being appointed Judge of the United States Circuit Court, nor the election of Ben. Selling as president of the Oregon House of Representatives. Highly gratifying is the mission of Harry Otis Sand-

berg as special commissioner to South America in the interest of establishing friendly relations between the United States and South American republics. Of truly historic importance is the election of Moses Alexander as governor of Idaho, not only because Mr. Alexander is the first Jew who rose to such rank, but also because he is of foreign birth, and a professing Jew.

In political life, the defeat of the anti-immigration bill by President Wilson's veto, (Jan. 28) and by the failure of the House of Representatives to pass it over the President's veto, (February 4) is the most important event. The defeat of the same measure two years ago by the veto of a republican President, and now by a Democrat, should convince the country including the most determined know nothings, that serious statesmen will not assume the responsibility for such an anti-American, illiberal measure. Various legislatures passed resolutions in favor of instructing the federal government to compel Russia to grant to her Jews the rights of human beings, when a peace congress once is convened. The international Jewish emancipation Committee formed in New York with Champ Clark as chairman, (June 18) has a similar object.

We wish that within the Jewish camp there should be a more encouraging outlook. Unfortunately we are divided as we were at every time, when union was most needed. The trouble lies in the discord between the American Jewish Committee, and the National Federation of Zionists. The historian has to be impartial and therefore I limit myself to the

statement that the Zionists charge their opponents with an assumption of authority and undemocratic principles. Owing to the principles of the American Constitution, all authority comes from the consent of the governed, and in our case no one can represent anybody else unless the one, who is represented, gives his consent, or else Sazonoff and Goremykin would have a perfect right to claim that they know better what is good for the Russian Jews than we here in America. Of events of Jewish interest in the various State Legislatures only one fact is worth recording. New York politicians perpetrated a bill which put the illicit sale of kosher food articles under penalty. No matter what we think of the position of the dietary laws in the Jewish religion, we certainly condemn fraud, but seeing how various factions of the rabbis of New York City charged each other with incompetence or laxity in ritualistic law, and how in Chicago—though fortunately ended by compromise—two rival Matzos factories with their rabbinical indorsers, carried their disgraceful controversies into court, we must sincerely regret that the large number of Jewish voters in the Atlantic Sea Shore cities creates such opportunities for the wily politician. If these people were serious they could without troubling any legislature put a trade-mark on their articles, which would absolutely protect them.

American antisemitism is as a rule not worth while discussing. It is very unpleasant to read an advertisement like one published recently in an Eastern paper of a summer home, with "Fresh vegetables, fresh eggs, old shade, and no Hebrews," but it is

hard to do anything against such meanness with the aid of law. No more could we do much against narrow fanatics like Rev. John S. Rutledge of Cleveland, who expects to win over the German element to the cause of prohibition and perhaps also to that of pew rental in his church, when he recommends the prohibition ticket with the promise that such legislation would only affect the Jews. The "man of God" is either very ignorant about the brewing interests in this country, or is, what we call in plain Anglo-Saxon, a liar. Far more serious is the action of the students of the Western Reserve University of the same city. Their Annual contained outrageous insults to Jewish students, announcing for ten years hence special courses in fire sales, and the like. One wonders whether these precocious youngsters know of the position that Jews have conquered for themselves in American academic life in spite of clerical intrigues. One wonders whether they have ever heard of a Michaelson, of a Jacobi, of a Jacques Loeb, etc. To expect that they should have heard of Paul Ehrlich would certainly be too much. More serious is a break made by ex-Governor Pennypacker of Pennsylvania, who, in a letter to the "Public Ledger" (April 25) spoke of certain "racial elements, who are responsible for the destruction of our friendship with Russia." The most depressing case along this line, however, is that of Leo M. Frank. The crime, committed near Marrietta, Ga., on August 17, will be a blot not only on the history of the State of Georgia, but on that of the whole country. The matter is too fresh in the reader's memory to require an extensive

presentation. The yells of a maddened mob that cried "Let us shoot the body of the Jew full of holes!" and the statement of Tom Watson in the "Jeffersonian" published the same day, "Let Jew libertines take heed," and the allusions to the imaginary slush fund, and to the Jewish conspiracy, in which not only Adolph S. Ochs and Nathan Straus, but even Pulitzer, Jr., who never was a Jew, are supposed to have taken part, shows clear analogies to the cases of Captain Dreyfus, and Mendel Beiliss, with the exception that neither in France nor in Russia do mobs take the place of courts nor are dangerous demagogues of the type of Tom Watson allowed to be at large.

The Jewish Year began favorably from the point of view of official preferment, gained by British Jews. Sir Matthew Nathan was appointed Under-Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Mr. Edwin S. Montagu was first made a member of the privy council, and subsequently appointed chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster with a seat in the cabinet. Thus again two Jews were at the same time members of a British cabinet, a position which no Jew occupied before 1910. The disappointment was soon to follow. A new cabinet was formed in order to be more representative of all politial parties, and the two Jewish members, Mr. Herbert Samuel and Mr. Edwin Montagu, were not included. Nor was Lord Reading, who was scheduled as Lord Chancellor, appointed to this position. The Anglo-Jewish papers learned, "from a most reliable source" that a cabinet could not win the country's undivided confidence, if a Jew should be a member of it. For some time previously this dissatis-

faction with the rise of the Jews was noticeable. The Irish press, both of Ireland and of this country, was provoked at the terrible spectre of a Jew governing the island. The appointment of Mr. Montagu to the chancellorship of Lancaster was criticized on the ground that he would have the right to assign church livings, and Lord Reading was even accused in the "Morning Post" as being partial to interned aliens, because they were Jews. The effect of such charges on internal Jewish affairs was very serious. The Board of Deputies, charged with the representation of the political interests of the Jews, went so far in their "Patriotism" that they would not take any step to provide kosher food for interned aliens, who are observant Jews. A trustee of the Sefardi congregation, whose board has charge of the Montefiore College at Ramsgate, which is practically a poorhouse for retired ministers, went so far in his "Patriotism" as to demand the expulsion of a minister who is 76 years old, and has lived for fifty years in England, because as a native of Germany he was an alien enemy. It was only by the casting vote of the chairman that this motion, as stupid as it is mean, was defeated. Nor did this gasconading patriotism do any good. Jews, employed in the government's works in Liverpool, had to be discharged because the other laborers would not work together with them. "The Morning Post" criticized the government for giving silver contracts to Montagu and Company, and lumber contracts to Myer. In regard to the latter. Sir Arthur Markham said in the House of Commons, "the sheenies always have preference," thus establishing a

record in parliamentary language that we were used to hear only during the heat of the Dreyfus affair when the "Youtre" was created, or in the speeches of the gutter-politicians in the Austrian Reichsrat. A little satisfaction may be gained from the fact that Sir Alfred Mond whose father, a native of Kassel, kept already totally aloof from Judaism, and whose daughter insisted on being married in a church although her chosen husband was a full-blooded Jew, was told in the House of Commons that he had no business to meddle with such questions as the Welsh disestablishment. All the smaller incidents of a similar character we could not possibly mention, though it is certainly significant that a paper like the "Evening Standard" should allow a correspondent to refer to the Jews as "slimy skins and vermin" and that the "Catholic Herald" just at this period should vehemently deny the report that a Jewish chaplain in the French army passed a crucifix to a dying soldier, at the same time blaming the Jews for the so-called persecution of the Catholic Church, not only in France, but even in Portugal where they number 500 among a population of 6,000,000. The "Times", as stated before, having adopted a strictly antisemitic policy, disseminates through its war correspondent, Stephen Graham, in a very clever manner the idea that the Russian Jews deserved their fate, and the same author in an article, published in "Liberal Review," insinuated even the ritual murder as a fact, going so far in meanness as to state the Russians, "would willingly spare the Jews an accidental Christian child now and then." Archdeacon Cunningham of Cambridge may have

taken an example from Stoecker, when he said that, "Liberals, socialists and pacificists are worse than Jews." To state it briefly, the expected change of the Czar's heart of which the Anglo-Jewish Press spoke with an enthusiasm which can hardly have been genuine, did not materialize, but England became fairly Russianized. Zangwill's "Melting Pot" was prohibited in Edinburgh at the request of the foreign office, attacks by a mob were made on the Jews of Hull, where only lately a Jew had been mayor, and the attacks on the foreigners in the east end of London, following the sinking of the Lusitania, were practically directed against the Jews, although the Jewish press tried to apologize for the mob, as it also felt it must display its genuine British patriotism by speaking of "alleged" cruelties against the Jews of Russia and by denouncing the American Jews as favoring the German side. The climax came, when the Russo-Jewish Committee, created in the Pogrom era was disbanded as supposedly unnecessary just at a time, when hundreds of thousands of Russian Jews were rendered homeless.

From France our reports are very meager. For some unexplained reasons the French Jewish newspapers have not reached us during the whole year, and for a time L'Univers had ceased publication. We have read, however, of wonderful acts of bravery, and of distinctions won by Jewish soldiers. All students of the Rabbinical seminary joined the Army, one of them died from exposure in the trenches, Rabbi Abraham Bloch, who served as chaplain, was killed on the battlefield in the first weeks of the war, and as far as known, is the only army chaplain killed,

Among the Zouaves are a number of African Jews. One of them, Judah Ben Burak, was decorated in the hospital by his general, and praised as an example of bravery. Rose Vecht of Amsterdam, who served as nurse in the Belgian army, was killed on the battlefield. In this connection, we might mention that Paul Hymans who toured this country in the interest of Belgium, was appointed Belgian minister to London. Unfortunately, on the other hand, we hear also a great deal of antisemitism. Abraham Levy, an officer in charge of a military hospital in Brittany was accused by antisemites of peculations but was completely exonerated, and a Nice paper published an interview of a retired Russian general, Count Muraviev-Amursky, who said that Russia and France have the same enemies, namely the Jews. Still more important are letters published in the Socialist paper "Guerre Sociale" in which Russian Jews who served in the Foreign Legion complain of the persecutions which they suffer at the hands of the rowdies who make up this branch of the French army, while their compatriots who remained in Paris are abused and even assaulted as dodgers from military service.

Some Italian Jews had joined the French army even before Italy declared war. At least one of them was killed and two were wounded. The nationalist papers of Italy, which lashed the government into a declaration of war evidently found it serviceable to indulge in attacks on the Jews, calling Max Nordau a "Cane Circonciso" and speaking even of Liebknecht as a Jew. The declaration of war brought the Jews to the front and two days after hostilities began, the

Jewish captain Ovazza was killed. The list of casualities was soon increased. The minister of war appointed four rabbis as chaplains, which is a rather large number, considering that the English army only lately received a second Jewish chaplain. The position of the Jews in public life is very encouraging. The new ministry, which following the example of France and England, is to represent all parties, has a Jew, Salvatore Barzilai, as a representative of the socialists. Independent of the war is the appointment of two Jewish senators, which brings the number of actual Jewish members of this body up to seventeen, and the appointment of Ludovico Mortara as president of the court of cassation. It is very gratifying to notice that in spite of the fact that Italy fights by the side of Russia, ex-premier Luzzatti took part in a meeting which passed a resolution declaring that at the peace congress, equality of rights for the Russian Jews shall be demanded.

In last year's review the following passage occurred: "The present war may have a very important effect on the position of the Jews. Year after year complaints were voiced in the Reichstag on the discrimination against the Jews in the army. In the present war it would seem natural that some Jews will distinguish themselves and thus obtain the rank of officer which is being persistently denied to them in times of peace." This prediction was amply fulfilled. Several hundred Jews were raised to commissioned rank in the German army. As especially prominent we would mention the case of Gottfried Sender, killed in action, since, who won the iron cross both

of the second and of the first class, because as a teacher at the Jewish normal school of Berlin, he was certainly singled out as a Jew. It is also significant that for the first time in history a Jew was made lieutenant in the Saxon army. It is rather depressing to notice that "Jewish Chronicle," which ought to know better from its American exchanges, reports that the decoration of Albert Ballin with the iron cross met with opposition because he is a Jew, while more than three thousand other Jews including four chaplains have received the same decoration. Among the distinguished soldiers, as among the heroes who lost their lives on the battlefield, are historic names connected with the rabbinate of all religious parties. A grandson and namesake of Ludwig Philippson and of Samson Hirsch occur side by side. Both the orthodox and the liberal rabbinical seminaries mourn the death of students, fallen in battle. The acts of bravery are too numerous to mention. Veterans of the Franco-German war have rejoined the colors. One of them, who had served as surgeon, in 1864, 1866, and 1870, conducted a hospital train to the front, in spite of his age of nearly four score years. Jews serve in all branches of the army, as bicyclists, as aviators, as telegraph and telephone operators, in very large numbers as army and veterinary surgeons, and it is certainly a fact of which the Jews, not merely of Germany, may be proud that Albert Ballin is the manager of the railroad transportation system for the army and that Louis Aronsohn was appointed financial adviser to the administration of the occupied part of Russian Poland.

In the sufferings of the war, the Jews had to share in common with their neighbors. Many of the smaller congregations of East Prussia were completely ruined, and foreign Jews had to undergo considerable hardships as aliens from an enemy country. It must be said, however, to the credit of the German Jews, that, different from those of England, they had the courage to do their best, both by charitable acts and by intervention with the government to alleviate the misery of these innocent victims of war. In various questions as regarding the widows of fallen soldiers, or the transportation of bodies to Jewish cemeteries, and the relief of congregations that suffered from the war, the government showed complete impartiality. It also warned occasionally, and in a few instances suppressed, antisemitic publications. Whether this policy will outlast the war is another question. We have no right to be pessimistic, but it is not without significance that in a debate in the Prussian diet as late as February 27, the minister of the interior had to admit that he discriminated against foreign Jews who were elected to a congregational office which according to a law, passed December 10, 1913, should carry with it naturalization. In other words, Christian foreigners, when elected to a clerical position, become naturalized, while Jewish foreigners in a similar case are, at least as a rule, not naturalized. We have, however to admit the justice of a statement by Profesor von Mueller, dean of the University of Munich, who excuses the discrimination against foreign Jewish students in German Universities with the fact that Russia unburdens her own duties on

foreign countries, so that the medical department of the university of Koenigsberg had 36 per cent of Russian Jews. It is directly gratifying that a paper like the "Allgemeine Evangel. Luth. Kirchenzeitung" which always stood for intolerant Protestant Orthodoxy, speaks in the highest terms of the patriotic acts of the Jews in the present war as a record that can never be forgotten. On the other hand individual outbreaks of antisemitism, as the appeal of a pastor in Westphalia to his confirmation class not to patronize Jewish stores or a denunciation of the Jews on the ground that they are dodging service in the field, being able to bribe the military authorities who allow them to do their military service in safe offices are small matters. A record not to be very proud of is Ernest Lissauer's "Song of Hatred." Zangwill, cleverly but, as far as we know, not correctly, said the Song of Hatred was written by a Jew, who had become a convert to the "Religion of Love." The Anglo-Jewish papers tickled themselves with the rumor that Lissauer plagiarized George Herwegh, which is absolutely absurd. Lissauer, himself seems now to regret this outburst of chauvinism. A realy noble, our enemies would say, Christian record, was achieved by the aged Rabbi Solomon Bamberger of Sennheim in Alsace, who saved the city by his intercession with the German general who had ordered to destroy it on account of the treachery of the mayor. It is a theme worthy of the pen of a great poet or the brush of a great painter that the aged rabbi remained in the city until the shells had destroyed the synagog and reduced the scrolls of the Torah to ashes. To the same class be-

longs the record of Karl Bodenheim, a German living in Zurich, who was the first to suggest the exchange of disabled prisoners of war.

The war records in Austria are much more important on account of the greater number of Jews in the army, and on account of the higher position that Jews always held in the commissioned ranks. There are at least two Jews of the rank of general, one holding that of a lieutenant field-marshall, which is the second higest rank in the army, and the highest ever held by a Jew in active service. Archduke Karl Franz Joseph, the heir presumptive, said very encouraging words to representatives of Galician congregations, after the re-conquest of the country, the most important being the statement made in Czernowitz: "We shall never forget the patriotism of the Jews." In Austria also occasional outbreaks of antisemitism occur. A clerical paper claims that the Jews in defiance of the law, had stored vast quantities of provisions away instead of reporting them to the government. A preacher in a Vienna church, wishing to console his audience, at the time when Galicia was invaded by the Russian army, said that all that Austria lost is a province whose inhabitants are people with "Peikeles." A little more serious is an antisemitic speech made in the Hungarian diet, but owing to the irregularity of the mails and to the strict censorship, no exact details are available. The most serious condition created by the war, was the invasion of Galicia by the Russian army, lasting nearly a year. The misery of the fugitives who fled upon the approach of the Russian hosts, was one of the most

pathetic instances in our history. Little towns with a population of a few hundred Jews in modest circumstances, had to take care of destitute exiles from five to ten times their own number. Those that remained in Galicia were exposed to the barbarities for which the Cossacks are justly famous. Pillage, murder, and rape were daily occurrences. A number of prominent people were held as hostages, and sent to Siberia or to the interior of Russia. Count Bobrinsky, whom the Russians made governor of Galicia, proved by orders that he was a true disciple of von Plehve. Like his sympathizers in the Russian Duma, he announced that all real estate in the hands of the Jews would be divided among Russian veterans. Judging by the present outlook, the Bible seems to be right, and one "Who girdeth his armor, shall not boast himself, as one who taketh it off." The condition of the Jewish population of Galicia and Bukowina, numbering a million in round numbers, is still within a grave crisis. Their homes, hovels of misery even in times of peace, are destroyed, their economic conditions, always a struggle for eking out a mere existence, are very precarious and the future is very dark.

The number of Jews serving in the army of the Czar whose policy since he ascended the throne was aimed at their annihilation is estimated by a reliable satistician as 385,000. We may gain information by typical individual points. Of 6,000 Russia prisoners interned in Hammerstein, 638 were Jews, and of 4,000 killed on the battlefield of Radom, 200 were Jews. This would indicate that the proportion of Jews in the Russian army varies from five to ten per cent. Acts

of bravery have been reported that admit of no doubt. Even the "Government's Messenger" reported cases of Jewish soldiers who were decorated for conspicuous bravery. The "Hajnt" of Warsaw, reported instances of Jewish boys of 13 and 14 serving as volunteers. The number certainly was so lage that the leading anti-semitic paper, Nowoye Wremya, threatened not to publish any more names of Jewish soldiers, decorated for bravery, if the Jewish press should continue to use these facts as arguments for emancipation. Outside of military duty, Jews also showed their patriotism in many ways. The Czar himself received a Jewish Committee that handed him 100,000 roubles for war purposes. Leon Brodski, the Kiev manufacturer, gave the government a million of roubles as a subsidy for Russian commerce, and yet J. Foster Fraser says in the "London Standard" that the real objection that Russia has against financial advice from England was that English finance is supposed to be Jewish. Jewish hospitals were opened to all soldiers regardless of creed, and careful provisions were made for the religious comfort of the Greek Catholics. The appointment of Jewish army chaplains, however, was denied.

From the begining the policy of the military administration was to cast suspicion upon all Jews indiscriminately charging them with espionage. It was but natural that such official announcements, made by commanding generals, would at once be taken as proof that Jews were guilty of treason. There seems, also to have been a definite system in it. Miassojedoff a colonel of the gendarms, was a spy himself, and in

order to shield himself, he incriminated the Jews in every instance in which the movement of the German troops showed that they had been informed of Russian military secrets. His treachery was discovered and he was hanged. In spite of this fact, up to this very moment, all Jews were indiscriminately expelled on short notice from cities which the German army approached. They had to be ready within twenty-four hours, and often no means of transportation were furnished them. Even the places where they were allowed to go were restricted, not merely by the law of the Pale, but even by the creation of restricted areas within the Pale. This fear of the Jews as spies extended even to the Mongolian border, where no sensible human being could expect that espionage would be of any value to Russia's enemies. In addition to the cruelties of the administration, atrocities were committed against the native population by the troops supposed to be armed for the protection of the country. The stories reported by Rabbi Arthur Levy, chaplain in the German army, read like events of the Indian warfare of the 17th century. Sazonoff declared in the Duma these reports as inventions, but the naming of persons and places by Rabbi Levy clearly shows that the statements unfortunately must be true. About cruelties perpetrated by the government on its own subjects, we have state's evidence. Stolypin, the brother of the assassinated premier, surely not a man apt to be prejudiced in favor of the Jews, quotes in Nowoye Wremya, which too, is surely not conducted with Jewish bias, the case of Jewish parents who were not

permitted to see their dying son in a Petrograd hospital, because as Jews they had no right to enter the capital of the Empire, for whose sake their son had sacrificed his life. Equally cruel is the case of a Jewish soldier who had lost his arm, and was sent from Moscow back to the Pale, although his native city was in the hands of the German enemy. Prominent Jews called on the premier; the Jewish Duma-member, Friedman, himself expelled from Poniewezh, the city of his residence, brought this matter up for discussion in the Duma, but without result. Another very sad feature is the hostility of other oppressed races like the Poles and the Letts, and as if history had the intention to be a satire, a German school official in Kempen spread the silly story that the Polish Jews send bombs to Germany to be used against the German army. The "Dva Groshe" continues its agitation, and lately a picture postal card was sold in Poland, showing a supposed ritual murder.

At the beginning of the war the Anglo-Jewish press, in a fit of patriotism, which cannot be taken as genuine, painted the future of the Russian Jews in the rosiest colors, claiming that all their troubles were due to German influence, and that from the moment Russia entered into an alliance with Great Britain, a new era of happiness was in store for the unfortunate victims of Muscovite tyranny. Unfortunately the prophecy proved like that of Hananiah ben Azur, (Jeremiah, Ch. 28). It may have pleased the unthinking masses, but it was not the truth, spoken in the name of the Lord. A great many corporations of mercantile and industrial scope, some cities outside of

the Pale like Saratov, and various Zemstvos petitioned the government for the removal of Jewish disabilities. The liberal members of the Duma, various prominent authors, among them Maxim Gorki and Leonid Andreyeff, even clergymen like Bishop Nikon of Siberia, indorsed this movement very strongly but there was no response on the part of the government except that Chvastov, the new minister of justice, said that the country is in favor of retaining the existing restrictions. Several important changes took place in the cabinet, the most important being the appointment of Count Ignatieff as minister of education, and of Prince Cherbatoff as minister of the interior. The first appointment was greeted by our British Press enthusiastically as the dawn of a new era. The latter was ignored by it, but it received the approval of the arch-antisemite, the Duma member Markoff. As a matter of fact, nothing has occurred during the whole period to justify the belief that there has been a change for the better. Individual instances are too intricate to be reported, but the fact remains that none of the restrictions on the right of residence, and on education have been removed. In the latter respect one instance shall illustrate the situation. Petrograd has a neurological institute, which as a private institution, is not subject to the governments' regulation, and receives Jewish students without limitation. The government offered it the privileges of a state's institution, if it were willing to restrict the number of Jewish students to 6 per cent, generously permitting the students, already enrolled, to remain until they shall have finished their course. A press dispatch, dated July 28, informs us that the

presidents of the universities, in a meeting passed a resolution in favor of this nefarious principle, which excludes Jews from educational institutions, to the maintainance of which they have to contribute by their taxes. A few weeks previously we were informed of a similar resolution, passed in a convention of high school principals. Even conversion to Christianity is not always a remedy. Last year's review reported the case of the Finnish pastor Pichro, who did a lively business with baptismal certificates, issued to Jewish students. These certificates were declared invalid. One student, expelled from the university on the ground of this "Trefa" baptism, went to Petrograd to be baptized a second time by a kosher pastor, but to no avail. The minister ruled that he had proven himself to be a man of bad character by his first baptism. A similar rule of the senate declares that children under fourteen years of age must not be baptized unless their parents convert to Christianity also. This is done to prevent parents from having their children baptized in order to give them an education. One should imagine that the government would at least want the Jews to remain Jews, but even this is not always the case. A law passed during the spell of liberalism in 1905 allows Christians who are descended of non-Christian parents to convert to a non-Christian religion. Maklakoff, the late minister of the interior, had scruples. He wanted a decision from the senate on the question whether this law means that both parents must have been non-Christians, whether it applies to grandparents, and so forth. In other words if a Jew became

a Christian and married a Christian woman, he shall not have the right to bring up his children as Jews.

In order to conciliate the Poles, the government granted to Poland municipal autonomy by a law issued March 17, (30). This law says that Jews can in no case elect more than 20 per cent of the members of a municipal board, and not more than 10 per cent if their percentage in the population is below 50. One instance will make it clear. Warsaw has forty per cent Jews, who on the ground of their prominent participation in the industrial life, pay far more than fifty per cent of the city's taxes. Yet they cannot elect more than ten per cent of the city council, nor can they hold the offices of mayor, vice-mayor, chairman of the city council, or any salaried office in the gift of the city. In spite of the war and the large participation of the Jews in the army service, the 300 roubles fine for not appearing for military conscription, was mercilessly collected. Let this again be illustrated. A young man from Bialystok, may have been clerking in Kalisch, which was occupied by the Germans in the beginning of the war. He is called to report for military service, but he does not come, for he cannot leave Kalisch. Nevertheless, his father in Bialystok is fined for not producing his son before the military commission. A small but very typical incident shows how the government wishes the Jews to understand their prospects. The daily "Hajnt" of Warsaw reported that the American press was discussing the plan of calling a Jewish congress. Then follows a blank space, ordered by the censor. This space evidently contained the statement that this congress was to take steps for securing to the Jews

of Russia equality before the law, but the government did not allow the Jews to know it. The incidents in the course of a year illustrating the cruelty of the restrictions on the right of residence are too numerous to be stated, though it is hard not to yield to the temptation of exposing tyranny for which we have no parallel in Western Europe, unless we go back to the fifteenth century. Four very typical cases, however, shall be very briefly mentioned. A Jewish jeweler who did business outside of the Pale, on the ground of the privilege granted to merchants of the first guild, died. His widow was administratrix of his estate, and continued the business for the purpose of winding up the affairs. The court sentenced her to be sent back to the Pale, and to the confiscation of her goods. Upon appeal to the senate she obtained a new trial, the result of which has so far not been reported. The widow of a physician in Libau inherited a house; the court decided that she must sell it, because through the death of her husband she lost the right to reside and own property outside of the Pale. Even in the days of Nicholas I, the families of Jewish soldiers who had served their 25 years in the army, were given unrestricted rights of residence and of holding property. The son of such a soldier recently bought a house in Astrachan. The senate annulled the transaction, because the sons of such veterans can only hold real estate in the places where they reside, and this man was not a resident of Astrachan. The most outrageous case was that of the widow of a Jewish Cossack, who wished to transfer her property, situated in the territory of the Don Cossacks, to her son. Both the father and grandfather of the young man had

served as Cossacks during their whole life. The senate however, ruled that the land must be taken from the family, because they could not produce an imperial certificate, entitling the grandfather, who was a Cossack as early as 1846 to hold a share in the Cossack territory.

It remains rather remarkable that the real murderer of Jossel Pashkov, whose murder gave opportunity for a ritual murder intrigue, was convicted, but the government made up for it by heavy sentences against forty Petrograd lawyers who were convicted of contempt of court, for protesting against the manner in which the Beilis trial was conducted. Three of them were disbarred for a year, and thirty-two for six months. The latest press dispatches at hand, dated London, August 24, report the announcement of the government that it is willing to abolish the Pale. Pharaoh always was ready to set the Israelites free, when the plague became serious, but he usually reconsidered his promise, when the outlook was more favorable for despotism. One fact is a glory to Israel in all this trouble. The Russian Jews have given us an unprecedented example of heroism, patriotism, charity and self-respect. They have collected seven millions of roubles for the exiles, driven from their homes by an ungrateful government. All that they did in the way of housing the exiles and feeding them will never be known. In addition they showed an unparalleled self-respect in the face of adversity. Before Kovno was invested by the German army, the governor demanded of the Jews hostages for good behavior, but they declared they would rather go into exile. Comparing the attitude of these unfortunate subjects of a

merciless autocracy with that of their co-religionists in Great Britain, we feel that a historian of future centuries will judge them as the rabbis in the Mishna: (Yoma 3, 11) judged two classes of Jews in the last days of the temple. For reasons, that one who will consult the passage will understand, we prefer not to quote it verbatim.

The apprehensions of an entry into the war by the Balkan states have up to this moment not been realized. We have therefore little to report. Roumania began to expel Jews from the border districts. The reports were according to the established rule in such cases denied, but the lastest cable advices declare that King Ferdinand ordered the expulsions to be stopped. Greece gave us a surprise. Five Jews were returned to Parliament from Salonica. Unfortunately, the latest news bring us a report of a blood accusation in Corfu, which, judging by a similar event in 1891, may become very serious. The only thing of interest about the Jews of Turkey relates to Palestine. The government closed the schools of the missionaries from enemy countries, maintained in Constantinople, and handed them over to the Jews. The Evelyn de Rothschild school in Jerusalem was closed temporarily, and the principal, Miss Landau, had to leave the country because she was placed before the alternative of becoming a naturalized Ottoman subject, or of leaving the country. She preferred the latter. Other news from Palestine are contradictory, and probably present a true picture of the inconsistent policy of Turkish officials. One report speaks of the military commander, Gemel Pasha as persecutor of the Jews,

and another report states the opposite. An undeniable fact is the expulsion of numerous foreign subjects, especially Russians, from Palestine who created a very serious problem in Egypt, where again the numerous Austrian subjects are treated as alien enemies.

Impartial reports coming from Christian sources, and written shortly before the outbreak of the war, give us the pleasant assurance that the agricultural colonies of Palestine were progressing very favorably, when the war created a crisis. In order to save the orange growers who could not market their product on account of lack of shipping facilities, 600,000 francs were raised, of which the American philanthropists, Schiff, Rosenwald, Lewisohn, and Guggenheim raised one-third. The demand for an autonomous Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, which was rather too noisily voiced seems to have been responsible for the prohibition of all Zionistic activities in Palestine, but Russia on her part also seems to dread the effects of the Zionistic movement on the patriotism of her Jews. Various courts fined the Zionists and sentenced them to terms in prison. The indorsement of the Zionist aims by politicians of various types is rather remarkable. The "Times" of London, the "Guerre Sociale" of Paris, look forward to a realization of a Jewish state, as a means of solving the Jewish question. "Tribuna" of Rome, as well as our friend, David Starr Jordan, and the apostate, Max Epstein, unite in urging the realization of an autonomous commonwealth in the Holy Land. The project has certainly its serious side, for England would hardly have permitted the transmission of $125,000 to the Ahuzah (Palestine Land Society), were it not anticipated that

the good will of the Jewish colonists in Palestine was worth while having. The Polytechnic at Haifa, which was the cause of such a serious disruption in the Zionist camp a year ago, was brought at sheriff's sale by the Hilfsverein for 225,000 marks. The Hilfsverein claims that it was the only way by which the institution could be saved. Its opponents claimed that it was a trick to obtain possession of the institution. The return of peace will furnish us an opportunity for a clear understanding of the situation.

The beautiful statement in the Midrash, that Israel may be asleep in the practice of ritual law, but is always awake to the demands of charity, was exemplified this year. The war made heavy demands on Jewish benevolence, not only in the countries stricken by war, but also in neutral countries. The full extent of charity, done by the Jews of Sweden and Denmark, will never be fully known. Of the heroism of the Russian Jews mention was already made. The provincial communities of Austria were heavily taxed by the need of caring for destitute fugitives from the war zone, but the regular charitable activities did not all cease. Only a few of the most prominent cases, shall be mentioned. For the Jewish hospital of Cleveland, in the course of construction, $525,000 were subscribed. The Young Women's Hebrew Association Building in New York was erected at a cost of $348,000. The gymnasium of the Chicago Hebrew Institute, said to be the best equipped in the country, was erected at a cost of $125,000. Nor were Jewish benefactions confined to Jewish causes. Indeed, one sometimes feels, as Nordau so brilliantly put it, that our Cincinatuses drive

the plows of other people. Julius Rosenwald of Chicago, whose benefactions are regular features of our annual reviews, donated a geography and geology building to the University of Chicago. Harry M. Levy gave $50,000 for the building of a medical school in Cincinnati. Emil C. Bondy, of Summit, N. J., left $225,000 for public benefits, both Jewish and non-Jewish, the largest being $100,000 to Columbia University. Nathan Barnert is building from his own funds a memorial hospital at Paterson, N. J., Mr. Flersheim, of Frankfurt a. M. bequeathed to the local university 1,000,000 marks. Arthur M. Myers of Auckland, New Zealand, gave to the city, a park and a school for backward children. M. Rauchwerg of Odessa gave a piece of property worth about 100,000 rubles for the estabishment of model tenements. A comparatively small sum, but his whole fortune, was left by Alexander Louis, a London journalist, to various charities. He remembered the Salvation Army, and the Jewish Board of Guardians; the Western Synagogue, and the vicarage of St. James. As an instance of conditions in a section of Europe of which we are usually not well informed, the case of Meir Solomon of Volo, Greece, may be cited, who left various sums for the erection of hospitals in Greek cities.

The old synagogue had the practice of closing the Yom Kippur services with the call, "May we celebrate it next year in Jerusalem." This was only a form of expression that meant may we be able to celebrate the festival next year under more satisfactory conditions. So let us hope that next year we shall be privileged to offer the prayer of thanksgiving to God, who led from sorrow to joy, from darkness to light.

THE YEAR 5676 A. M.*

AZARIAH DEI ROSSI, the pioneer of the Renaissance movement in Judaism, devoted the fifty-fifth chapter of his "Imre Binah" to the discussion of Judaism's relation to patriotism, and in the course of his remarks he says: "Inasmuch as our remnant is scattered from one end of the world to the other, we cannot help but believe in universal peace and prosperity, for woe to mankind if anyone falls, because all of us have red blood, which is precious in the eyes of our God. Therefore it is our duty to believe in the words of the wise, and in the ancient counsels of the prophets of truth, who demand that we pray earnestly for the welfare of all countries, asking that the Lord remove from their hearts all jealousy, and enmity, and spread peace on earth, for through their peace he will pour down peace upon us also, and all nations will see and acknowledge, and God in His grace will exalt our horn, and make sprout the offshoot of David His servant speedily." (Meor Enayim, ed. Ben Jakob II, 178 Wilna, 1865.)

The reviewer of the history of last year is deeply impressed with the truth of these words, first published by the brilliant and much attacked scholar in 1574. Our sources of information have been greatly reduced. The Yiddish and Hebrew papers of Russia have been suspended for two years. The kind care of the British censor has deprived us of German and Austrian papers for nearly six months, the French

*The American Israelite, September 28, October 5, 1916.

papers, for reasons unintelligible, have often failed to reach us, and the English papers appear reduced in size and restricted in contents.

Zangwill in his "War for the World" brilliantly says, the only country which the Russian steam-roller so far has crushed is England. Russia, always occupying the front rank in Israel's sufferings, now leads the world in influence on Jewish affairs. She, therefore, by right ought to have the first place. Our information is, of course, fragmentary and uncertain. The leading fact is, that Goremykin resigned as premier, and was replaced by the well known reactionary Stuermer, February 2. Liberal papers of Russia had previously reported that Goremykin and the Holy Synod were the powers behind the throne, and were advising the Czar against making any concessions to the liberal parties. Stuermer could not disappoint us, if he, as he did, pursued the same policy still more vigorously.

The Department of the Interior, which has to deal with the restrictions on the right of residence, the heaviest burden for the Jews to bear, was given to Alexis Chvastov, former governor of Nishny-Nowgorod, and member of the reactionary party in the Duma. The election of the Jew Steinmann, as member of the Upper House, September 30, is, under the conditions, of no consequence. Every day brought us some news of reactionary measures, that border on the idiotic. The governor of Kiev prohibited the printing of Yiddish books. When in rare instances the Duma passed a favorable measure, as the removal of the restrictions of Jewish membership

in stock companies, the government vetoed it, because it would mean the right of Jews to own real estate indirectly. When the Block had the courage to discuss some of the worst outrages, as the spreading of circulars by the government authorities, in which the Jews were charged with high treason, the conservative wing of the "Block," the Octobrists, withdrew at the last moment, and the interpellation did not find the necessary support. What the real reactionaries would do under such conditions could not surprise anybody. In their name the well-known Markoff announced that his party would not deviate in the least from its program on the Jews. An opportunity was offered to the government to show at least a willingness to make a concession. A motion to give the Jews the franchise in the county elections (Zemstvos) was defeated, the government insisting that all such measures must be postponed until the revision of the whole Jewish legislation could be taken in hand. The Romans had a proverb for indefinite postponement, saying that it was left. "Ad calendas Graecas." The Russians still stick to the Greek calendar. A bill for the relief of the peasants was introduced into the Duma and passed, but the question of the residence of the Jews in rural districts prohibited by a "temporary" law, passed May 3, 1882, was not allowed to be touched, though as a temporary measure it might have been revoked by the government even without consent of the Duma. The war administration, feeling that it was hopelessly compromised in public opinion, by the whole history of the war, found it to its advantage to charge the

Jews with espionage. The Duma deputy Zingareff, discussing this act of treachery, pointed to the fact that Sukhomlinoff, ex-minister of war, was under indictment for treason. Myasoyedoff, colonel of the gendarmes, and Colonel Ivanoff were hanged. Grigoryeff, the commander of Kovno, was also under indictment for high treason. Myasoyedoff was responsible for spreading the charge of espionage against the Jews in the western border district. This was a ruse on his part to turn away suspicion from himself. Nevertheless the charges continued, and were supported by the highest military authorities, including Grandduke Nicholas, the "glorious" commanding general.

We have heard so much for the last two years about that wonderful influence, which England, as ally of Russia, will have in liberalizing that country, whose only misfortune had been that it was altogether under German influence. Our hope is so far not realized. Baron Heyking, Russian consul in London, the official whose experiences should help, more than that of anybody else, to liberalize his native country, was asked by the Chamber of Commerce to give his opinion on the future of the Russian Jews. He might have been polite and given a favorable reply, but knowing how solid the position of his country was, with England as her creditor, he smilingly replied, that he was no prophet. The Anglo-American financiers, meeting with Russian ministers on a visit to London, timidly inquired as to the future treatment of non-Russian nationalities in Russia. The chairman found that this was an impolite attitude to the

representatives of a friendly country, and ruled the question out of order. M. Bark, the minister of finance, who needed a little more sympathy in the interest of the stock exchange sentiment, invited the delegates of the Jewish Conjoint Committee to meet him, but as the "Jewish Chronicle" delicately puts it, the committee did not see fit to publish the gist of the conversation. He was a little more explicit in a conversation with Appleton, a Jewish labor leader, to whom he said that it was in the interest of the Jews that the government could not make any concession now. The loan of a hundred million roubles, which M. Bark had come to negotiate was then already concluded. Not more hopeful was the view of Professor Paul Miliukoff, the liberal leader, who admitted in May, 1916, that there was little hope for the Jews in Russia. The same man had declared in the Duma in August, 1915, that the persecution of the small nationalities was the cause of Russia's misfortune. It is evident that George Baklanoff, the baritone of the Boston Grand Opera, is right when he says that the real cause of the misfortune of the Jews is the corrupt bureaucracy.

The bureaucracy has the premier Stuermer as its natural head. He sent out a circular to all subordinate offices, to watch the Jews in all railroad stations and public places, to bring them before a military tribunal on the slightest suspicion, and although the suspicion may not be proven, they are to be exiled to Siberia. The reason for this order is, that he believes the Jews are responsible for the large number of desertions in the army. Even in small matters

the hostility is manifest. When in order to regulate the meat supply, the sale of meat was restricted to three days in the week, including Saturday, the Jews asked that an exception be made in favor of Jewish butchers, who should be permitted to sell meat on Fridays, which was denied. The authorities were apparently too busy to pay attention to the religious needs of the Jews, but had time, to watch these peculiar crimes, of which only the Russian criminal code has any knowledge. The lawyer Rabinowitz in Moscow was fined for calling himself Michael, when his name was Mordecai. Far worse was the punishment of one Krasik, who was sentenced to a year in jail. His crime is so typical of the revolting barbarity of Russia that it deserves to be noticed. Krasik's wife had the right to live outside of the Pale, but her husband had not. Now a child was born to them. The father risked being discovered as having clandestinely lived with his wife, which would mean not only punishment of both, but also the loss of her right of residence. He met the situation by registering his own child as illegitimate. The ruse was found out, and Krasik sentenced to a term in the penitentiary. It seems that this fact alone should suffice to make anyone ashamed of himself, who attempts to palliate Russia's crimes against humanity.

That the constant charges of espionage, treason, and desertion are malicious fabrications can be seen from the following fact which is undoubtedly typical. A Jew of Kishineff, named Kazap, was fined three hundred roubles for the non-appearance of his brother

before the military commission. There is of course no earthly excuse for any Jew living in Kishineff to dodge his military duty. He ought to know that he may be needed tomorrow to prevent his fellow Jew from defending himself in the case of a pogrom, but Kazap happened to be in Palestine at that time, was expelled as an enemy subject, went to Alexandria, where he joined the mule corps, and was wounded in action. Nevertheless, his brother has to pay the fine.

There is not the slightest outlook to see any of the restrictions removed. Various attempts were made to allow Jewish lawyers unrestricted practice and Jewish students to enter schools and colleges, but at best a concession was made in individual cases, and with all this Markoff charged Ignatieff, the minister of education, with crowding Russians out of public schools in order to accommodate Jews. Egoroff of the staff of "Nowoye Vremya" was a little more honest. He said to an English Jew that a Russian could not compete with the Jew in intellect. The same tedious list of barbarities on one hand, and trivial measures of relief on the other, is seen in the various actions of public authorities on the right of residence Whole communities were expelled, some on six hours notice, some were refused admission to places to which they had been originally directed, all of them were subjected to incredible sufferings. One case, however, shall be quoted again, as a specimen of an almost incredible combination of brutality and stupidity. Two Jewish families, father and son, possessed the exceptional right of residence in a

village of the government of Kiev, as blacksmiths. As observant Jews, they had a calf killed by a Shochet, called from the nearest town, and sold the hind quarter For this crime of having engaged in commerce, they were sentenced to be sent back to the Pale, though the father had two sons and two sons-in-law serving at the front. The barbarous treatment of soldiers wounded in battle is a matter of daily experience. Some are expelled as soon as they are able to leave the hospital, even those who were decorated with the St. George medal receive no better treatment.

No consideration is paid to those who have no real home, because their home town is in the hands of the enemy. Uncertain reports, but by no means incredible, come via Germany and Scandinavia, of pogroms, and refugees that came to this country via Siberia and Japan say that pogroms that will exceed anything that we have known are in preparation. Some of these stories may be due to the excitement which is only too natural, but two secret documents, signed by two generals, in which all commanders are directed to gather material incriminating the attitude of Jews as soldiers, have been found by the German army and published verbatim. The soldiers are already instructed to tell anything incriminating the Jews, when they come home. The object is absolutely clear. Equally clear is the object of a circular issued by the minister of the interior, charging the Jews with responsibility for the high price of all commodities. Other stories calculated to poison the mind of the population are reports that Jews are hoarding coin and are burying it in the Jewish ceme-

tery. This went so far, that the funeral of Rabbi Kantor of Riga, held in the night out of fear of mob violence, was stopped by the police, the corpse removed from the coffin, the latter and the shrouds searched in the middle of the street for the supposed hoarded coin. The government did take some measures to punish the offenders, but the offenders were those who expressed their indignation at such an outrage. One can easily imagine what impression it is bound to make on the Jewish population, when they hear that von Beseler, the German governor of Poland, dissolved a Polish society, which under the shield of aid to war sufferers, carried on a political agitation against the Jews.

The entrance of Rumania into the war on the side of the Allies, has in some respects a favorable significance. It will at least be legally possible to open the Roumanian question at the peace congress. But from a practical viewpoint, it merely means that the Allies will have to bring sacrifices in order to obtain the good will of Israel's enemies, who declare that the question of the Jews is a strictly internal one. The names of the two statesmen who are chiefly responsible for the entrance of Rumania into the war, Bratiano and Jonescu, are well enough known to dispel any illusion. The latter gave promise that the rights of the Bulgarian Jews living in the territory recently anexed to Rumania, would be respected, and we know what became of it. British influence in this case has also been sufficiently tested. Sir Edward Grey in his reply to the Anglo-Jewish Association, dated January 9, 1913, gave the assurance that the

Rumanian minister to England had made the same promise, and so we know that we may discount what the present viscount promised when a baronet. At home, where the gentlemen are less inconvenienced by public opinion, matters are simpler. At the dedication of a synagog in Silistria, the sub-prefect warned against cherishing any illusions. In a discussion on riots, in which the Jews as usual, were the victims, the minister, in reply to an interpellation as to what he would do to curb the iniquitous activity of the Jews, promised an investigation. No investigation was demanded or promised when the drunken son of a priest started a riot in Buhusu, and a Jew, attracted by the noise, left the store and was shot by the maddened drunkard. The Jew was the father of a family of ten children, but for this the murderer was not to blame. It was just his misfortune that he stepped in the way of a Greek Catholic patriot, who was determined to celebrate by killing a Jew. That a veteran of 1877 was expelled from a village is a small matter. It does not form a legal precedent for those who shall serve through the present war.

From the era of the court Jews in the seventeenth century, we have been used to differentiate between distinctions conferred on exceptional individuals and the condition of the masses. In regard to the former, the year was one of remarkable achievements from British Jews. We have now two Jews in the cabinet, who are cousins at that. Herbert Samuel, reappointd chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in November, was appointed afterwards home secretary, January 10th. His cousin, Edwin S. Montagu, was ap-

pointed chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. The press comments do not seem to mirror a favorable reception of this fact among the public. The "Morning Post" finds it ill advised to place a Jew in charge of an office, which has to deal with the administration of the immigration law. Mr. Montagu's appointment displeases "The Globe" because his father, the late Lord Swaythling, has directed in his will, that his children shall be disinherited, when marrying out of the faith, and indeed the daughter of Lord Sheffield, before marrying Edwin Montagu, had "to abjure the New Testament for the Talmud." Of other honors by titles of nobility and similar anachronistic tinsels we shall only quote the raising of Lord Reading to the rank of Viscount, because this first Jewish Lord Chief Justice and Viscount is charged in "Sunday Chronicle" with pro-German feelings that make him surrender patriotic principles of English common law. The fact that Sir Matthew Nathan happened to hold a prominent position in the Irish government at the time of the rebellion suggested to the "Daily News" the thought that a Jew as member of the government was the last straw that broke the back of the patient Irish camel. The meanest of all expressions of official antisemitism is a resolution passed by the Council of Tring, demanding supervision of all aliens, naturalized or not, which was directed against Lady Rothschild, a venerable old woman, for more than fifty years a resident of England, and member of the family, which considered it its highest pride to improve the district where their family estate is situated.

Only malice can deny that the British Jews have done their full duty to their country in the hour of crisis. Unfortunately there are no statistics at hand yet, but it is safe to assume that there are from ten to twenty thousand Jews serving in the army and that about one thousand have sealed their patriotism with their blood. Most of them have joined before conscription was made a law, and a great number belong to the best families. To quote one noticeable case, Reuben Ginsberg of Montreal, twelve years old, said to be a grandson of Rabbi Samuel Salant of Jerusalem, was wounded at Ypres, while riding a motorcycle as a messenger. "Globe" remarks that there is nothing especially laudable in Jewish patriotism, because the Jews have been treated in England so exceptionally well. Jewish soldiers, writing from the front, suggest that the treatment which they receive is not that of true comradeship. For this reason a number of them deny their religion. It is a fact that a drill master in Birmingham, who had done excellent work, was discharged because he was a Jew, and Sergeant Issy Smith, who had won the Victoria Cross, the highest military distinction, was refused service in a Leeds restaurant, so that we surely do not wonder that a Jewish student, wishing to give a party in a restaurant in the same city, was turned down, although two soldiers on furlough were members of his party.

One must not wonder if foreign Jews are not very enthusiastic in their desire to serve, and British Jews have a right to claim that they are doing more than their duty. Yet the comparatively large number

of Russian Jews of military age, residing in Great Britain, and refusing to serve in the army—to which privilege, by the way, they were only recently admitted, created considerable irritation against the Jews. It was claimed by the hostile press, that these Jews profit from the war through the opportunities offered by the scarcity of labor. "East London Observer" put it in the following harsh words: "If Jews find it to their advantage to honor this country with their presence, they must discharge their civic obligations." All sorts of rumors, a great many rather improbable, fill the press. Somebody overheard Jews saying that England was not their country, and military tribunals treat all claims of Jews with downright suspicion. The Jewish community tried to do its best by persuasion and unfortunately also by suggesting, upholding and approving of coercive measures. Only non-Jews, prominent among them Mr. Joseph King, M. P., had the courage to oppose the alternative of either service in the British army, or deportation to Russia, offered by the home secretary, Mr. Samuel. At this writing, the matter is still in suspense, and will in all probability remain so, at least until Parliament re-opens.

That professional antisemites, like the brothers Chesterton, should find the present situation a welcome opportunity, must surprise nobody. It is indicative of the same spirit that we could observe in Germany during the height of the antisemitic movement, when Sir Alfred Markham complained in the House of Commons that a Jew was allowed to adopt his name. We heard similar complaints by

families of old German nobility like the princes of Lichtenstein, fully a hundred years ago. Perhaps the most depressing sign of the growth of anti-semitism is the joining of its ranks by the London "Times." If one should have predicted this fact in 1891, when the great Mansion House meeting was held to protest against the Russian barbarities, and the "Times" devoted to the meeting a special issue, he would have risked being called mad. Now Mr. Morgenthau is blamed for giving too much time to Zionism, and overlooking the massacre of the Armenians. In the style of the "Kreuzzeitung," the "Times", February 26th, spoke of the Jewish finance, "as the greatest menace to the Allies" and of the "Neue Freie Presse" as a Jewish organ. The Hungarian Jews are held responsible for the fall of Belgrade. Jewish revolutionaries are said to be the real perpetrators of Armenian massacres. Stephen B. Graham, the war correspondent of the "Times," fills columns with attacks on the Russian Jews, and one actually finds relief in the plainer statement of Madam Olga Novikoff, who says, "You are our allies, and you have to love Russia, with her repressive laws, and her persecution of national minorities, or else you are pro-German." In the eyes, not merely of people like Chesterton, but of the leading press organs, all Jews are pro-German. "Catholic Herald" has fully equalled Berlin "Germania" and the late Vienna "Vaterland." Not only are all Jews in the Russian army traitors and spies, but ritual murder stories and even host desecration miracles are excavated from many archives for the edification of British citizens of the

twentieth century. The situation no doubt is humiliating to British statesmen. One can readily sympathize with Viscount Grey when upon the request of the Jewish Conjoint Committee, that he demand at a trade conference, held in Paris, the abolition of the disabilities imposed on Jewish Englishmen traveling in Russia, he had to make the reply that it was found impracticable to submit this question to the conference. But it is humiliating to Great Britain, that the British Board of Trade should be compelled to issue a memorandum to its membership, declaring that Jewish agents of British firms would not be admitted in Russia, even at this moment, when the air is full of projects how to strengthen the commercial ties connecting Russia and England in order to eliminate Germany from the Russian market after the war.

Land of Cromwell, Locke, and Macaulay, "how art thou fallen from heaven, oh day star, son of the morning!" It was said before, that the attitude of men like the Chestertons is not surprising, yet is significant in the light of other events, that Cecil Chesterton should have said in a meeting of the Fabian Society, interrupting an address of Zangwill, who said, it would help England's position in neutral lands, if Russia were to give to Jews equal rights, that Zangwill ought to be placed against a wall and shot. The chief of police of a London borough reported to the mayor that he could not be responsible for the safety of the Jews in his district. We have not heard of such a report from Berlin in Stoecker's palmiest days. The climax of these sad experiences

lies in the fact that a high class periodical like "Athenaeum" published in June a poem by Arthur Symons, a really high class poet, describing a rich Jew "his eyes swollen with covetousness" seeing a street cleaner whom he flings "a penny once a month or so."

"The old man, who is humble, poor, and wise,
Takes up the penny and says, Thank you, sir;
And the kind Jew, to purify his eyes,
Rivets them back upon his ring and fur."

Would one believe that it is a hundred and twenty years since Richard Cumberland staged his "Jew" with such remarkables success? From England's Allies little can be reported. French antisemites, however, evidently are plying their trade as before, judging from the fact that Gustav Hervé, the socialist leader, publicly brought charges against army commands, which persecute Jewish soldiers, and the things must be quite bad, when the Anglo-Jewish press refuses to publish them. Rather amusing is the statement of Emil Verhaeren, the Belgian poet, who says that Germany is not a country of Christians, but a Christian body with a Jewish soul. Into free Switzerland, the spirit of national irritation has entered, and Professor Eternod of Geneva insulted the Russian Jewish students of his class, calling them traitors. The faculty compelled him to apologize. From Australia hails the only Jewish general serving in the British army but Mr. W. M. Hughes, the premier of the commonwealth, declared in a London club, that "we mistook mere wealth for greatness, no matter whether the wealth was in our hands or in those of German Jews." Boulay, a member of

the Canadian Parliament, plays an accompaniment to his Russian colleague, Markoff, charging the Jews with responsibility for the high prices of commodities. Sir Robert Borden, the premier, and Sir Laurier, the leader of the opposition, defend him. At the time, when the first Zeppelin raids were made in London, Jewish shops were attacked. The Anglo-Jewish press then claimed that the mob mistook the various Wiltchinskys and Katschmaroffs for Germans, misled by their names. In February Jewish shops were wrecked in Cradley Heath. The rioters claimed that they took a shopkeeper, whose name was Harry Harris, for a German. The Anglo-Jewish press still acts, in spite of its professed Jewish orthodoxy, in accordance with Tertullian's Christian principle. "Credo quia absurdum est." Were it not impossible for our British coreligionists to be guided by the views of such a Hun as Martin Luther, I would say their attitude reminds of Luther's stand on Trinity. That three are one, the great reformer says, no one can demonstrate rationally, but "Wer's glaubt wird selig." From Italy nothing beyond distinctions, won by Jews in the army, can be reported. It is highly creditable that Italian rabbis, ministered fearlessly to Austrian prisoners, and that Rabbi Margulies of Florence, obtained through the personal intercession of the king, the release of his brother-in-law, a Galician Jew, who had been taken as prisoner to Russia. Wonder what would have happened, if Chief Rabbi Hertz, a real "Hun" from the Carpathian mountains, would have interceded on behalf of a Hunnish brother-in-law. Poor Russian Jews are

worse off than any war victims. At home they are traitors, spies, usureres, and abroad they are alien enemies. England and France look at them askance, and even in Denmark the police is trying to keep them out. It is the most tragic presentation of the question put by Siegfried in Sudermann's "Sturmgeselle Sokrates," to his father, Rabbi Marcuse, "Wohin gehoere ich?"

The kindness of the British censor has prevented us during the last five months from learning the events of Jewish interest in Germany, and in this way perhaps we have been spared some unpleasant news. As it is, it seems an injustice to give a picture of conditions, which may in the meantime have completely changed. Last fall, we learned of hot arguments on the question of the situation which Polish Jews shall occupy in the event of an annexation of Russian Poland to Germany. Commercial and industrial societies petitioned the chancellor to insist in the peace treaty on the abolition of all restrictions imposed on foreign Jews in Russia. Indeed the German chancellor made such an announcement which British politicians declared to be a ruse, although on their part they made no attempt to do likewise. An anonymous writer in "Grenzboten," a magazine founded by the Jew Kuranda, prophecies a revival of antisemitism after the war, in consequence of the immigration of Polish Jews. He foresees especially a "Kultur Antisemitismus," due to the preponderance of Jews in the professions and in literature. A similar warning was sounded by Wolfgang Heinze in "Preussische Jahrbuecher," which

since the publication of Treitschke's "Ein Wort ueber unser Judenthum" in 1880, was more or less an organ of such Kultur antisemitism. The university students, in the public press, and through petitions, demanded measures against the influx of Jewish students to German universities. This could as readily be foreseen as similar demands by the antisemitic member of the Reichstag, Werner, who in harmony with the policy of his party, pursued for the last thirty years, also demands restrictions on the "Ostjuden." It is depressing, however, that at this critical moment, the Jewish congregation of Danzig should have seen fit to amend its constitution by a clause against membership of foreign Jews. The governor vetoed this clause on the ground of a decision rendered by the minister in a similar case in Duisburg, issued May 4, 1914. Danzig protested against this veto, because owing to the war the probability of immigration of Polish Jews had become a more serious question than it was in May, 1914. It is certainly peculiar that at the same time a German Jewish Ottoman Union should have been founded, to further closer relations between Jews and Turks. In some diets (state legislatures) occasional antisemitic debates occurred. Pfleger, a clerical member of the Reichstag, complained that Jews are given preference in appointments to the advisory board on the grain supply, and are in this way enabled to escape service in the field. The government defended the measure on the ground that such members must be selected for their business experience, and that Jews happen to be prominent in the grain business.

The usual charges against the Jews as responsible for the high price of food stuffs were voiced in the Reischtag and in the diet of Bavaria. An anonymous information against Jews in Eltville, for dodging military service was thoroughly investigated, the writer, a woman, was ascertained, and sentenced to a term in prison. More serious is a letter by the widow of a soldier to an antisemitic paper, in which the hope is expressed that a three months old baby will honor the memory of his father by implacable hatred of Englishmen and Jews.

The mendacity of the antisemitic press is illustrated in a notice of "Hammer" that Max Nordau who was sixty-five years old at the outbreak of the war, is a dodger from military service. Whatever one may say of Prussianism, its efficiency is also manifest in suppressing all attempts at disorder. A pastor von Harling had announced a lecture on "The Jews and the War." The government would not allow it to be delivered. The antisemite, Heinrich Pudor, who, to quote Heine, tries to make up by "Gesinnung" for what he lacks in talent, had sent his antisemitic letters to the soldiers at the front. The government, having found out the character of the publication, required that every issue be submitted to the censor, before it can be sent out. More subtle is the antisemitism of the radical theologians of the Wellhausen school, who of late have found admirers and imitators in our own ranks. Karl Budde, one of its leading representatives, found fault with a war prayer adapted from the Dutch by the Jew, Joseph Weyl, which had become quite popular. Budde, the radical Bible

critic, finds that this prayer is un-Christian. The "Schlesische Zeitung," a conservative organ, which in 1878 took a leading part in launching the anti-semitic movement, was indignant at Grandrabbin Dreyfus, of Paris, for a remark on the barbarity of the German army, The clerical organs, "Koelnische Volkszeitung" and "Schlesische Volkszeitung," the latter also one of the leaders in the antisemitic movement, endorsed this condemnation, oblivious of the attitude of Cardinal Mercier of Belgium, which was far more severe than that of the French rabbi. It deserves mention that Pastor Rade, in an essay on Hermann Cohen, expressed his regret that Cohen, owing to his Judaism is not appreciated as he deserves to be, and also that "Deutsch Voelkische Blaetter" of Hamburg, having disregarded the warning of the government, were suppressed for their antisemitic attitude.

The unreliableness of our information appears from a report, which went through the whole American press, that the rabbi of Charlottenburg recently received the iron cross and that this was the first case of such a decoration bestowed on a Jewish army chaplain. This is positively not true. At the time, when we still received German papers which is not later than the end of March there were already ten Jewish chaplains so decorated. Their work was recognized, both by the Bavarian and the Prussian war administrations. The chaplains, who up to the beginning of 1916, served as volunteers, receiving only free transportation and lodging, are now salaried, and for the first time a Jewish chaplain to the German

navy was appointed. Concessions were also made to Jewish congregations, to whom a quantity of wheat flour for Matzos was assigned. Jewish households were also exempted from the injunction to mix animal fat with butter in baking. Soldiers who can prove that they always were observant Jews, have the right to obtain their meats from outside, whenever feasible, and to receive a compensation in money. The administration in Poland was especially considerate. In Warsaw a school committee, consisting of a rabbi and two orthodox lay members, was organized, and at the reopening of the Yeshibah in Slobodka near Kovno the military commander made an address. This is quite interesting because this Yeshibah was founded by the late Israel Salant as a bulwark against German or secular culture. His own son had, much to the sorrow of his father, entered the University of Koenigsberg. Far more important is the decision of the German authorities in Warsaw, refusing to entertain the demand of the Poles to introduce a percentage restriction on Jewish students at the University. The Prussian minister of the interior, in spite of the warning of the antisemites, charged the Hilfsverein and the orthodox Agudath Israel with the task of placing Jewish mechanics from Poland in Germany.

From Austria the reports are still more meager. We have heard of the formation of an Austrian Central Committee for the protection of the political rights of the Jews in the northern theater of the war. At the head of this organization is Baron Louis de Rothschild, the senior member of the Vienna firm,

hitherto not known as interested in Jewish affairs. The reason for creating this organization is not known. It was reported already in December that a prosecuting attorney in Neu Sandec said in the course of the trial of a Jew, that the ethics of the defendant were that of the Talmud, which teaches to hate the "Goy." Following the example of Germany the Austrian military and civil authorities made exceptions from the food regulation in the consumption of wheat flour for Passover. The scarcity of fats led to a restriction in the use of candles, and upon the request of the government, Rabbi Aaron Lewin, issued a circular, that no household should burn more than two candles on Sabbath, and that the synagog should not use any candles except the two placed in front of the reader's desk. The most serious trouble is the distress of the Jews in Galicia, which country was occupied and vacated in turn by the Austrian and the Russian armies. Terrible is the plight of the poor exiles, who were sent to Siberia, lacking the necessities of life, and exposed to the terrible climate with insufficient clothing. The situation of those who were left in Galicia, and whose means of support are almost entirely cut off is equally bad. No sooner had the Russians occupied a town, when they removed Jewish judges and other officials from their posts. As a rule the Polish and Ruthenian population looted Jewish houses, when the Russian army entered. In Rybotyc near Prezemysl, when the Austrian troops reoccupied the town, five Jews, with the permission of the military authorities, took the property stolen from them, from Christian houses

where they found it. The court sentenced them for this fact, because it constituted larceny.

Hungary may just now, owing to the entrance of Rumania into the war, suffer serious trouble. Our last report indicated a favorable situation. In the fall of 1915 the Jews celebrated the twentieth anniversary of the "Reception." This term has to be explained. From the seventeenth century on, when the War of Thirty Years had proven the impossibility of unifying the religion of a state, the law distinguished between "received" religions with full corporate rights, and "tolerated" religions, whose adherents were merely permitted to worship without being recognized as a church. Judaism in Hungary, up to 1895, was merely a "tolerated" religion. When it became a "Religio Recepta," the practical effect was, outside of certain privileges at court ceremonies, the right of non-Jews to convert to Judaism. The Jews, however, celebrated this event as a great triumph, and issued a special publication, to which prominent statesmen, and ecclesiatsic dignitaries, including the Roman Catholic primate, contributed sympathetic statements. There is, naturally, also some shadow besides the light in some remarks in Parliament that the Jews obtained the greatest financial benefit from the war. It is admitted, however, that they conducted themselves valiantly on the battlefield, and even the leader of the clerical antisemites, who prepares a book on the heroes of Hungary, asked the editor of a Jewish paper, to furnish him with material on the Jews. Jewish officers won laurels in the most glorious event of the

war, when the allied armies established connection with the Bulgarian. The regiment, which dealt the decisive blow was commanded by the Jewish colonel, Julius Bauer, and the first officer to join the Bulgarian troops, was Dr. F. Schoen, while another officer, Wertheimer, was dispatched with a report to General Mackensen.

The Jewish community of the United States, fortunate in being spared the horrors of the war, has also positive achievements to record, of which it may well be proud. While this fact has no exclusive bearing on the Jews, we are sufficiently interested in it, to give it the first place. The new Dillingham bill with its unjust discrimination against immigrants, was vetoed by President Wilson, December 7th, and is for the present disposed of until the new Congress shall convene. The interest of Jews in this measure is certainly not as great as that of the Italians and of the Balkan nations. Yet "Journal and Messenger" the unworthy representative of the church, to which Roger Williams, and John Bunyan belonged, considers this veto a triumph of the Jews "who usually want the earth" and whose "wealth would probably control members of Congress," an opinion not very complimentary to the character of American statesmen, among whom, as we see in the case of Mr. Hughes, are certainly some Baptists also.

A resolution, introduced by Meyer London in the House of Representatives, requesting the President to call a congress of neutral powers for the negotiation of peace, which shall include the removal of all disabilities of the Jewish people in the stipulations, was

referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, hardly with the expectation that it would have a tangible effect. Nor would one have expected from a similar resolution, passed by the American Federation of Labor at San Francisco, November 23rd, more than a moral effect. Of greater importance should Mr. Wilson return to office next March would be his statement, made to Mr. Simon Wolf, which practically promises what the previously mentioned resolutions demanded. This promise, however, was not made in an official way. A rumor which so far is mere gossip, had it, that the United States consul in Riga, said in a report, that the Jews of Russia, receive exactly that treatment which they deserve. It may be merely a matter of etiquette that the department refused to reply to the question, whether such a remark was made, but the report was certainly not disproven. The great political event of the year, was the appointment by the President of a day for the collection of funds for Jewish war sufferers. The most important question of our political life, involving the most momentous problem ever faced by Jewry, is the question what United States will do for the sake of procuring the removal of all disabilities from which Jews in lands of oppression are suffering, and what the Jews of America can do to bring about this end. This matter is still in suspense. The American Jewish committee thought that it was fully capable of conducting any negotiations required for that purpose. Various bodies, representing the great majority of American Jews, were of a different opinion. They believe that in order to create an impression

on public factors, it was necessary to call a congress which should represent all Jews of the land. The American Jewish committee opposed this idea, but when the congress party had held a successful convention at Philadelphia, March 26-27, the opposition weakened and concessions were made, which have not yet led to a mutual agreement. Inasmuch as the matter is still under discussion, since the meeting of July 16th has not led to definite results, we refrain from any further comment. The one step undertaken by the American Jewish Committee in a letter addressed to "His Holiness," Pope Benedict XV, December 30, 1915, that he should help the Jewish cause by his influence on the Roman Catholic Poles was not a success. In the opinion of leading Italian Jews, who ought to know something about it, it created in Italy an impression bordering on the ridiculous.

We are glad to report gratifying public honors won by American Jews. Oscar S. Straus was appointed chairman of the public service commission of the state of New York, and in this capacity rendered important service in the serious labor troubles, which agitated the east. The appointment of Louis Einstein, as the first Jewish minister to Bulgaria, is quite an event in Mr. Wilson's administration, which added to the diplomatic posts available for Jews those of Sweden and Bulgaria. Equally important is the appointment of Elmer A. Sperry as member of the naval advisory board, a position created by the present political complications, and perhaps marking a turning point in the fundamental policy of the

country. The appointment of Abraham J. Elkus as minister to Turkey, makes this post almost a Jewish office. Of epoch making importance is the appointment of Louis D. Brandeis as Justice of the Supreme Court, which is the first case of its kind. It took the Senate over four months before this appointment was confirmed. The appointment was reported January 28th and the Senate passed the vote of confirmation June 1st. The President added a new distinction by appointing Mr. Brandeis as one of the three members of the joint commission, which is to settle the Mexican dispute. Unfortunately Mr. Brandeis was compelled to decline the honor, owing to the importance of his work on the bench. This is at least the official version. If there were any motives besides the one given, we are reduced to mere conjectures. Nor do we know, whether the objection to Mr. Brandeis' appointment to the Supreme Court was entirely due to his radical views on the trust problem. We cannot know, whether there were not some senators who sided with Rev. David J. Burrell of the Marble Collegiate Church of New York, who opposed the confirmation of Mr. Brandeis, because he "is authoritatively committed against the religion of Jesus Christ." As evidence of the fact that Jews are doing their duty in all walks of public life, we have a right to quote the death of Corporal William Cohen, Fourteenth U. S. Cavalry, who was one of the few victims of the Mexican raid on Glenn Springs, Texas, May 5th.

Of internal events we quote with satisfaction the seventh annual convention of the Federation of Jewish Farmers, opened in New York, December 5,

which now consists of 56 branches, and 1267 individual members scattered over eighteen states. Of a similar nature is the formation of the Jewish Co-operative Creamery Association of Oyster County, New York, which operates its own ice plant and creamery. The progress of the agricultural movement among the Jews is slow, but it is a progress anyhow, though it will hardly convert the antisemites, who insist that the Jew merely lives of the labor of others, but we welcome it in the interest of our own people. Less gratifying are political achievements such as the bill, passed by the Massachusetts legislature, following the example of New York, which makes the sale of articles as kosher, which are not kosher, a punishable offense. It has been previously stated how ridiculous this law may become, when it places, as it undoubtedly will, the judge before the dilemma of deciding who of two contending rabbis is right. At all events the object, if the people were really honest, could be just as well obtained by a registered trade mark. It is different with another bill passed by the legislature of Maryland, which allows Sabbath observing Jews to work on Sunday. In all such steps, intended to invoke the aid of the state for religious purposes caution must be used, for it is of supreme importance that the Jews be not charged with breaking the principle of separation of church and state, when it is to their interest. Even a liberal organ as the "Springfield Republican" takes the Jews to task for opposing the reading of the Bible in public schools, calling their opposition, "lack of humility and ingratitude." We have quite a number of occasional utterances of antisemitic nature. "Western Christian

Advocate" finds fault with the Jews for opposing prohibition. A Methodist pastor of Brooklyn declared that the Jews of this borough are rank heathens. In an investigation of charges against the New York State Militia, it was proven beyond any doubt, that Jews were discriminated against. The students of New York university had to be forced by the faculty to include the "Menorah" in the list of student societies, whose names are published in the official yearbook. The refusal of private schools to accept Jewish students, especially in the case of girls, shows the existence of social prejudice. The funny side of our internal affairs is the resolution passed by the Union of Orthodox Ministers prohibiting intermarriage between orthodox and reform Jews.

The brightest side of Jewish life is now, as it was in the times of the Midrash, the feeling "I am asleep in the practice of religion, but my heart is awake in works of noble charity." More than five millions were raised for war sufferers, of which New York raised in one evening $816,000 and Chicago $350,000. Other cities contributed in proportion, and perhaps in larger proportion, when we do not include the well-known large givers. As always, we find the names of Jacob H. Schiff and Julius Rosenwald at the front. The first named gave half a million to Barnard College on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversity of his arrival in America. We are able, however, every year, to record new names. Mr. C. A. Ratshesky, of Boston, gave $100,000 as a first installment for a Jewish charitable foundation. Andrew Friedmann, the base ball magnate of New York, left a bequest of $7,000,000 for the establishment of a

home for old people. Mrs. Isaac L. Rice, perpetuated the memory of her husband by a donation of $1 000,-000 to the Beth Israel Hospital, thus placing an orthodox institution on a financial basis, which as yet is unique. The war, which made of the Pacific coast the safest port of entry for Jewish immigrants, led to the establishment of a Jewish Immigrant Aid Society at Seattle, Washington. The Guggenheim family added $165,000 to the previously donated half million for a Guggenheim pavilion in the Mt. Sinai Hospital, New York. The memory of a noble worker for Israel's cause is lastingly perpetuated in the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., dedicated May 3rd. An unusual, though well deserved honor was bestowed on Rabbi William S. Friedman for whom a building of the National Hospital for Consumptives, in Denver, was named. It is gratifying to know that over the care for war sufferers and for the unfortunate in our country, the aims of preventive charity and of education are not neglected. The new Hebrew Technical Institute of New York, was dedicated February 27th. The synagog and school extension work managed by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, raised $25,000 at a New York meeting, a rather small sum, but not without significance as a sign of the awakening to one of the great needs of the community. A recognition of the spiritual forces in Judaism, is the donation of $150,000 by Louis Marshall to be devoted to the religious education of girls who in this manner honored the memory of his wife.

From foreign countries we shall impartially report some of the most striking donations for the relief of the

misery created by the war. Fanny Ottolengui of Milan, gave $200,000 in addition to a tract of land, as a home for incurables. The Hirsch copper and brass works of Berlin and Halberstadt, one of Germany's leading firms, whose members are strictly observant Jews, appropriated from the profits of war contracts 300,000 marks for war relief, and 1,200,000 for welfare work. Julius Wolfner & Co. in Budapest gave 500,000 crowns towards the relief of widows and orphans of soldiers, and Bernard Wetzler of Vienna an equal sum. for an institute which shall study the question of feeding the people. The leather firm of Adler & Oppenheimer in Strassburg gave 1,200,000 marks for war relief.

The gravest problem of the war lies in the Orient and owing to the unsettled conditions there Zionist activities had to be suspended. The English Christian world, however, became especially interested in that problem, which is not very complimentary to the British Jews. There is also a great deal of internal trouble in the Zionist household. Joseph Cowen, the president of the English Zionist Federation, was hooted off the platform, because he indorsed the recruiting scheme of Mr. Samuel. Mr. Henry Morgenthau's remark that he had broached to Turkey the project of selling Palestine brought him the applause of "Daily Chronicle" and "Nottingham Guardian," but Max Nordau found it necessary to issue a strong warning against all schemes apt to offend Turkey, and Talaat Bey, the Turkish Minister of the interior, declared indeed that he looked upon political Zionists as enemies of his country, which otherwise welcomes Jewish immigration. With this

view Turkey's hereditary enemy, Russia, agrees. Several Zionists were sentenced to terms in jail for belonging to a society whose aims are not compatible with the patriotic duties of a Russian subject. Surely the Russian Jews have no reason to hope for a solution of the Jewish question, other than that which was outlined to them from the days of Nicholas I. All Czars have shown their affection for the Jews. Nicholas I kidnapped Jewish children becaused he loved them so. His successors would not allow them to emigrate, and placed a fine of 300 roubles for every one of their dearly beloved Jewish subjects who does not appear at military conscription, and pogroms have hardly ever been allowed to continue more than three or four days in one place.

The outlook is indeed sad. It requires all the optimism of a truly religious soul to say, "I have remembered Thy judgment of old, oh, Lord, and have comforted myself," (Psalm 119, 52). "With my spirit within me, will I seek Thee diligently, for when Thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness" (Isaiah 26, 9). We remember the elevating scene at the end of the old fashioned services for the Ninth of Ab, when after the dirges and the Book of Lamentations with their mournful wail were recited, the reader rose from the floor, and in a voice of triumph exclaimed, "For the Lord has comforted Zion, He has comforted all her waste places, and has made her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord, joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody" (Isaiah 51, 3).

ISAAC M. WISE.*

A TALMUDIC legend has it that in the hereafter the uppermost in this world will be nethermost, but those that are really great shall occupy the same place there which they have occupied here.[1] It is not always easy to determine which of our contemporaries will receive their place amongst the immortals. Only real greatness can be sure of its perpetuation.

Both enemy and friend will admit that the name which is heading this article holds an indisputable claim to a lasting place in the history of Judaism. It is connected with the development of that mighty and growing portion of Jewry which has settled in the Western hemisphere.

Isaac Myer Wise was born in Steingrub, Bohemia, March 29, 1819 as the son of the Jewish schoolteacher in that village. Bohemian congregations were diminutive organizations, and their schoolteacher combined in himself all the offices which were in the gift of the community. He was hazan, shohet, shammash, collector, mohel, rabbi, and, above all, the lightning rod whose duty it was to deflect the bad humor of the congregational bosses, who were not many, but as many as there were members in the congregation. The term of such a "rebbe" was as short as that of the American minister in the small towns, and to the intelligent members of the profession their lot appeared far from being a pleasant

*Jewish Comment, April 23, 1897.

[1]Baba Batra, 10b.

one. It was natural, therefore, that Loeb Weiss impressed his son with the idea that whom the gods hated they made a "Kaesrebbe,"[2] as the rabbis of the diminutive congregations of Bohemia were called.

The young man, however, was of an enthusiastic nature, an idealist, who had inherited the love for scientific pursuits and for activity in a higher sense from his maternal grandfather, a physician, who had made his studies in Italy. Prague, the old mother in Israel, was in those days the seat of a rejuvenated, vigorous Judaism, and found its proper leader in S. L. Rapoport, whose fame attracted talented and studious young men from all parts of Europe. Here it was where Isaac Wise received his inspiration.

In 1843, appointed preacher, as they said in those days, when the title of rabbi had become a by-word, because it seemed suggestive of bigotry, narrow-mindedness and hostility to progressive movements, he took charge of the congregation of Radnitz. But the conditions of Austria as they existed previous to 1848, when mediaevalism was the guiding principle of the government, could not but fill the ambitious young man with disgust. After having served his flock for three years, he made the daring attempt to cross the ocean, and arrived in New York in July 1846.

Shortly after his arrival he was elected rabbi of Albany, where he began at once to carry out the theories which the government of Metternich in

[2]Term of contempt used in Bohemia for the minister of a small congregation. Daniel Ehrman in his novel "Die Tante" explains it from the fact that these ministers were engaged in the cheese market of Pilsen.

Austria would have considered revolutionary. His congregation was amongst the pioneers of reform, and his activity brought him the honor of a call to the pulpit of Charleston, S. C., the first reform congregation in America. The entreaties of his friends in Albany caused him to remain with them, but not much later a split occurred in Albany on the reform principles. Dr. Wise was driven from his synagog on a holy day and was forced to worship with his friends in a private residence. Under those conditions he was glad to accept the call to the Bene Yeshurun Congregation in Cincinnati, with whom he has been connected ever since 1854.

It was in that year that he founded the American Israelite, the oldest Jewish weekly in America, to which a year later he added the German weekly, Die Deborah, both of which he is still editing, a record attained by very few men. In spite of his arduous duties as rabbi and journalist, he found time to write various scientific books, his eyes fixed always on urgent demands of the time. He wrote a text-book of Jewish history. He published a defense of Judaism against the claims of Christianity. He laid down his philosophical principles in his "Cosmic God," and he presented his views on the Bible in his "Pronaos, an introduction to Holy Writ."

The greatest and the most lasting of all his merits is the foundation of the Hebrew Union College, a rabbinical seminary which ranks as the equal of any European school of its kind. Many had attempted to do the same, for the growing number of American congregations required such an institution, but none

possessed the energy, the untiring zeal and the popularity necessary to carry such a scheme into effect.

No less a merit than the foundation of the college is the establishment of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, a body which comprises the leading rabbis of American reform congregations, and although in existence a comparatively short time only, is a firmly-established organization, older and better organized than any of its predecessors had been.

Had Isaac M. Wise done nothing more than to found the Hebrew Union College, the first systematic school for Jewish theology in America, this alone would constitute an indisputable claim on a lasting place in Jewish history by the side of Luzatto, Frankel, Geiger and Zunz. He is now seventy-eight years of age, and enjoys the full possession of his remarkable mental gifts, so that, like the rabbi of old, he can feel convinced that his place in the hereafter will be where his place was here.

DR. MOSES MIELZINER.*

WHATEVER may be said against the petty despotism of the Prussian bureaucracy, one point speaks in its favor: its strong organization was a force of good, because it carried its intentions into effect. After Waterloo Prussia had adopted a reacttionary policy and the victims of this policy were the Jews to whom the government in 1812 had made brilliant promises, which were now forgotten. In one respect however the government carried out its benevolent intentions. It strictly enforced compulsory education, and to this tenacity of purpose it is due that the Jews living in the parts of Prussia formerly belonging to the kingdom of Poland, became quickly and thoroughly occidentalized. In 1824 the Prussian minister of public education issued an order enforcing the establishment of public schools in the Jewish congregations of the province of Posen.[1] The rabbis and other orthodox people protested strongly, but to no avail. The conditions of this time are beautifully pictured in Aaron Bernstein's delightful novel, "Voegele Der Maggid."

Moses Mielziner was born, August 12, 1828, in the little town of Schubin, Kreis Bromberg, province of Posen. He therefore had the great advantage of growing up in a thoroughly Jewish atmosphere without being debarred from the contact with modern

*The American Israelite, February 26, 1903.

[1]Heppner und Herzberg: Geschichte der Juden in Posener Landen p. 221-222, Koschmin, 1909.

civilization. To this fact may be ascribed the happy harmony which always marked his character. His father, Benjamin, was rabbi in his native town. He died in 1850, about 50 years old. Nothing particular about him is known to me. His picture shows a fine head, one that reminds us of Rembrandt's picture of the rabbi expressive of kindness, earnestness and deep thought. He is dressed in the customary garb of the Polish rabbi, and most likely was of the type which characterizes that section of the Akiba Eger's school which had made peace with modern education.

Moses Mielziner's first teacher was Mr. Braunhart, who entered upon the duties of school principal in 1835, and is still living, being now ninety-six or ninety-seven years of age, and in full possession of his mental abilities, although totally blind. He was very proud of his distinguished pupil, and wrote him letters regularly, receiving tokens of kindness partly from Dr. Mielziner himself, and partly from other pupils living in America, whom Dr. Mielziner interested in the case of the unfortunately indigent monagenarian. Dr. Mielziner lost his mother at an early age, his father married again, and had several children of the second marriage. Naturally the household of a rabbi in a small town blessed with a very large family was not very affluent. In early years Mielziner left his paternal home and continued his education in the little town of Exin, where he took Talmudic instruction from Hirsch Klausner, (1802—1887) the author of Talmudic books[2] and the son of the local Rabbi Wolff Klausner, who celebrated his one-hundreth anniversary

[2] רין למשנה, Breslau, 1856. תא הרצים ib. 1864.

October 18, 1861.[3] He continued his secular studies without the assistance of a teacher, being thrown upon his own resources as was customary in those days. Feeling however that he required regular training, he went to Trzemesno, now called Tremessen, where his older brother Ephraim lived, a representative of the era of transition, called Haskalah. He translated German poetry into Hebrew, a specimen of which Moses Mielziner a few years ago published in the Haibri of New York. In those days Prussia had not yet adopted the policy of strict Germanization, and therefore the gymnasium of that city was Polish. Mielziner, who was not familiar with the Polish language and not desirous to acquire it, therefore left Tremessen to find another place where he could continue his studies. He was attracted to Posen by the fame of Solomon Plessner (1797—1883)[4] who, while strictly orthodox, was a student of German literature, an enthusiastic Jew and a deservedly popular preacher. When he first entered Plessner's house, he found him in his study wrapped in his Tallith and the Tefillin on his head. Such a thing was rather unusual. Even the orthodox rabbis of the old Polish style like Mielziner's father, would use their Tallith and Tefillin only during morning services after which they would at the utmost put on another pair of Tefillin, those of Rabbenu Tam[5] and study a page of the Talmud for another fifteen minutes, but to spend all day with the Tallith and Tefillin on, was a thing that characterized mystic eccentricity.

[3]Der Israelit, 1861, Nos. 2 and 4.
[4]Jewish Encycl. IX, 409.
[5]Shulhan Aruk, Orah Hayyim, 34.

Mielziner, who as already remarked, had imbibed that spirit of moderation which shrank from religious extremes, was repulsed by this sight, and so he continued his voyage to Berlin, where he arrived in the early forties. After some preparation he entered the gymnasium, where one of his schoolmates was the late chancellor of the German Empire, Count Caprivi.

These were eventful years for the Prussian capital. The political agitation for emancipation went hand in hand with the reform movement because everybody felt that some of the practices and dogmas of Judaism were out of harmony with the demands of modern citizenship. The majority of the congregation were conservative, but there was also a strong element which was in favor of radical reforms, including the abrogation of the normative character of the Rabbinical literature, the abolition of circumcision, and the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday. The conservative element feeling that they required a strong man as a leader decided to fill the position of chief rabbi which had been vacant since the death of Rabbi Hirschel Levin in 1800. They extended a call to Zechariah Frankel, who declined, and another conservative man, Michael Sachs, was called, who was preacher and "Rabbinatsassessor." The reform party in their turn elected Samuel Holdheim as preacher of the congregation, founded in 1845, which was the first in Jewish history to hold religious services on Sunday. Mielziner, while conservative in his inclinations, was a frequent guest in Holdheim's house, and also in the house of the ghetto-novelist and popular scientific author, Aaron Bernstein, who was a strong supporter

of the Berlin reform congregation and in fact may be called its founder. Of the life of the latter, Mielziner told many interesing details. Bernstein's newspaper articles on an art exhibition created such an impression that another paper wanted to engage his services. The representative of this paper hunted for the art critic on Rosh ha Shanah and found the versatile genius in the synagogue where he acted as hazan. On another occasion Mielziner was present in the reform temple on Yom Kippur and saw Bernstein, the radical, crying during prayers as he used to do in the old orthodox synagogue.

Both Holdheim and Bernstein did their best to assist the young student and the former, who had been Land-Rabbiner of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, recommended Mielziner to this successor, David Einhorn, who appointed him as preacher and teacher in Waren, 1852. The little diocese was then agitated by fierce religious struggles. The government which appointed the chief Rabbi had in the early forties favored religious liberalism by which it thought the Jews would become by and by converted to Christianity, which would make their emancipation unnecessary. After 1848 the government frowned upon religious reform as a demand of the revolutionists. Einhorn became disgusted and accepted a call to a newly formed congregation in Budapest, and the government of Mecklenburg appointed as his successor, an uncompromising orthodox, B. I. Luepschuetz, who would not even enter the synagogue of Schwerin because of the very tame religious reforms which had been introduced there. Mielziner, who did not like

this turn of affairs, decided to leave the congregation, in spite of the entreaties to remain, in which even the orthodox chief rabbi took part. After having held his office for two years he went in 1854 to his older brother, Solomon A. Mielziner, who was minister of the small Danish congregation of Aalborg. The congregation of Waren honored him with a loving cup and gave him tokens of the high esteem in which he was held. Soon after his arrival in Denmark he was offered a position as minister in Randers, a Danish city.

He acquired the language of the country very quickly and was soon called to Copenhagen as principal of a religious school, with which a preparatory theological school was connected. One of his disciples was Prof. David Simonsen, who up to a few weeks ago was chief Rabbi of Copenhagen. Denmark showed a peculiar condition, due to the small number of Jews and their free intercourse with their neighbors.

The majority of the congregation of Copenhagen, influenced by Hamburg, was orthodox, but a minority advocated religious reforms. The chief rabbi, Abraham Alexander Wolff, who died in 1891, at the age of ninety, having held his office for over sixty years was a man of moderate views who succeeded in compromising between the two extremes. The liberal wing wanted Mielziner to take the lead in establishing a reform congregation, but his peaceful nature was opposed to strife and he therefore was glad when the call of the congregation Anshe Chesed of New York reached him, and he accepted this position. In Copenhagen he had written his scholarly treatise on

"Slavery amongst the Ancient Hebrews," which was his thesis for degree of doctor of philosophy which he received from the University of Giessen in 1859. He also edited a Jewish almanac in the Danish language, and wrote various articles for the Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, and for the Ben Chananjah, edited by Leopold Loew, and the latter in recognition of his services, conferred upon him the rabbinical title. In New York he published several sermons in German, which were received with great appreciation. His best literary work was done, however, during the time that he held the position of professor of Talmud and rabinical literature, in the Hebrew Union College. To this time we owe his two most valuable works, "Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce," and his "Introduction into the Talmud." In both works we see the profound scholar, and the methodical teacher. But I can not close this article without referring to the genial atmosphere that permeated his household, brightened by mutual affection of husband and wife, father and children. His relations to the students were also of a fatherly nature. While a harsh word was hardly ever heard from his lips, his pupils respected him and took pleasure in doing what he wished them to do. His relation to his colleagues was one of genial friendship never marred by a domineering or haughty attitude. During the two years that he was acting president everybody felt inspired with the desire to do his best in order to please the kind and genial superior. The Talmud says: "A successful leader must have his shortcomings and a good man must have his enemies,"[6]

[6]Yoma, 22, b.

but if there was ever an exception to these rules it was the life of Moses Mielziner. He was one of nature's noblemen, an Israelite without guile, an honest man without an enemy, and those who were near to him experienced at his removal from their midst the sentiment so touchingly described in Jehuda Halevi's poem.

With melting heart and trembling knee
To God I call; my strength has flown.
The crew aghast on troubled sea
Their oars do drop, while sad winds moan;
This day e'en strong hearts grieve and sigh,
I lift mine eyes from earth on high.

JACOB H. SCHIFF.*

A man's individuality must be understood in the light of his environment, including the earliest traditions, which, though they may not have acted upon him directly, are noticeable influences in the shaping of his life. Jacob H. Schiff, born January 10, 1847, is a native of Frankfurt am Main. This ancient city, with its venerable Jewish community going back at least to the thirteenth century, produced a peculiar type of Jewish life. This may be seen in her many noted financiers, like the Rothschilds, the Worms, the Speyers, the Goldschmidts, the Sterns, and so many others found in all European capitals ,and some in countries across the sea, as leading men of finance. There must be a reason for this. It can be understood from a historical point of view. Frankfurt was, first of all, a large, probably the second largest Jewish community in Germany. In addition, it was for many years the seat of what we might term today the federal government. In later years there was at Frankfurt the seat of the German Federal council, and its location right in the center of the many small, German states, with their capitals within easy reach contributed to its importance as a financial center of the Empire. While the ghetto of Frankfurt, existing until 1792 as a legal institution and as an actual condition much later, was, according to our present ideas, a home of misery for the three to four thousand inhabitants, it was, measured by conditions of

*The American Israelite, January 4, 1917.

those days in Jewish communities in general, a seat of prosperity, which made it also a home of Jewish learning and of intense Jewish life.

The metropolitan character of the Jewish settlement already appears in the names, of which Schiff is one. Family names within Judaism, especially within German Jewish communities, are of recent origin. Their oldest legal enforcement does not date farther back than 1787, when such a law was issued in Austria. Frankfurt, however, owing to the comparatively large number of Jews, adopted a unique system of family names. In other old congregations we usually find names which indicate the town from which the family came. In Frankfurt, however, there were not only so many Abrahams, Isaacs and Jacobs, that they required a surname, but even so many families tracing their origin to Worms, or Speyer, or Mayence, that the system of naming them by their houses was adopted. Of the 625 Jewish families of whom we possess records, 66 were named after the houses in which they lived. Schiff is one of those names, like Adler, Kann, Rothschild, Schwarzschild, and the like. The Schiff pedigree in the Jewish Encyclopedia seems, from what I have been able to gather from the best and most authentic works, to a considerable extent drawn from imagination. The Schiff family has been traced back to the fourteenth century, while as a matter of fact the names of the houses do not go back farther than about 1600. At that time we find two prominent citizens of the Frankfurt ghetto, named Schiff. They are the two brothers, Jacob and Isaac. Jacob is known as a rabbinical scholar of high repute, and his

son Meir (called Maharam) Schiff, is even to this day proverbial for brilliancy in rabbinical studies. At the age of seventeen he was called to the rabbinate of Fulda, and his contemporary, Asher Halevi of Reichshofen, speaks of him in his memoirs (1629)[1] as one of the young luminaries of the rabbinical world. He died April 2, 1641, at the age of thirty-six, at Frankfurt-am-Main, and not, as the Jewish Encyclopedia[2] states, in 1644 at Prague. Most of his works are lost, partly by lack of attention, and partly through the great fire that completely destroyed the Frankfurt ghetto in 1711, but the little that has remained, and which his great-grandson, Meir Stern, edited in 1737, proved sufficient to bring his name down to posterity, as proverbial for profound rabbinical scholarship. The "Fraind," a Yiddish daily which appeared in St. Petersburg, speaks, in 1903,[3] of a brilliant man as a "gemorischer Kopp mit Maharam Schiff." In the same year the Hebrew daily, "Hazefirah,"[4] published at Warsaw, gives a description of a woman who, proud of her son's achievements, says to her neighbor, spreading her apron with both hands, "Such a piece of Maharam Schiff my boy studies every day." Maharam Schiff died at such early age that his work was not prepared for publication. What we possess consists largely of notes which the author evidently expected to work out at a later period. It is hardly fair to rabbinic dialecticism to illustrate it for a modern public by one quotation

[1]Die Memoiren des Ascher Levy aus Reichshofen im Elsass. Herausgegeben von Dr. M. Ginsburger, p. 25. Berlin, 1913.
[2]XI, 98.
[3]See: ib. 1905, No. 231.
[4]1903, No. 240.

from a seventeenth century work, but in order to present at least a faint idea of the studies of those days, and of the difference between our ancestors of 300 years ago and ourselves, one specimen of Maharam Schiff's Haggadic notes may be given.

The Talmud (Pesahim 53, b) says, when the three young men, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah were to be thrown into the fiery furnace, they hesitated, but after a little while they felt that it was their duty to sacrifice their lives, because, they said, "When God commanded the frogs in Egypt to infest the whole land, it is said. "They shall go into thine oven and thy kneading trough" (Ex. 7, 28). When, says the Talmud, is the kneading trough near the oven? When the latter is heated, and therefore the frogs, obeying the command of God, threw themselves willingly into the fiery furnace. Why, argued the three young men, should we not do likewise? So far the Talmud. Rashi in his commentary, wishing to explain the difficulty, that these young men should have hesitated to fulfill the divine command and take martyrdom upon themselves voluntarily, said they were hesitating because they reasoned that God's commandments should be fulfilled, "and you shall live by them" (Lev. 18, 3) which the Talmud explains (Yoma 85, b) one is held to fulfill the divine command only as long as he does not endanger his own life, and therefore they decided their act by comparing their case with that of the frogs in Egypt. Maharam Schiff now asks the question, how is it that these young men, who must have known that the Talmud (Sanhedrin, 74, a) declares that in times

of religious persecution it is our duty to sacrifice our lives in any case, should have to decide their action in such a round-about way? He answers it in this way: According to the biblical account (Daniel 3, 22) the furnace was so heated that even the men who threw the three youths into the fire were consumed by the heat. Therefore, there was nothing left for the three young men, but to walk voluntarily into the furnace. Now the difficulty arose for them: does the divine command require in such a case more than merely submitting to force, or do we have to sacrifice our lives voluntarily? This, they could only answer by drawing a comparison between their own case and the act of the frogs in Egypt, which led to the conclusion that they must at least be as willing to sanctify the name of God as the dumb animals.

Jacob Schiff, the father of Maharam Schiff, who survived his brilliant son (he died Nov. 28, 1654), did not leave any literary work behind, but I found some manuscript notes of his in the library of the Hebrew Union College, which show him to have been one of the typical rabbis of his time, like his contemporary and townsman, Jospe Hahn, bent on settling all the minutiae of the law that had been laid down in the Schulhan Aruk. Other members of the family of later date are still known as great rabbinic scholars, so Teble Schiff, rabbi of London, who died December 17, 1792, and his brother Meir, also a rabbinical author, who died at Frankfurt-am-Main, August 13, 1807. I even suspect Teble Schiff of having been a liberal for his day. At least, if I interpret rightly an allusion in the works of Ezekiel Landau,[5] he had

[5]Noda Bi-Yehudah, Orah Hayyim, II, No. 30.

declared it permitted to open an umbrella on Sabbath, provided one would not close it completely on Friday. As I am not positive in my conjecture, I would not risk insulting the memory of one who surely was a strictly observant Jew.

The family descended from Isaac, the elder brother of Jacob, is more prominent in the public life of the historic community. Isaac's son, Mier, who died December 8, 1694, is eulogized on his tombstone[6] as a man of great generosity, famed throughout the Jewish world. The family had evidently changed its habitation, for Isaac is called of the "roten Apfel." His son Moses is reported to have been so rich that he dowered each one of his children with 50,000 florins. They married, indeed, into the wealthiest and most prominent families of Germany of those days, as into the families of Behrens at Hamburg, and Gumpertz at Cleve. The youngest son Joseph, called Josebel, married a daughter of Maier Reinganum, the niece of the founder of the Mannheim Klaus which opened in 1708, was endowed with a capital of 100,000 thalers, an immense sum for those days.[7] Of Josebel's sons we know of one Herz, who died March 14, 1779, and is praised in the description of his tombstone as an upright man, a man of learning and of noble descent, at the same time modest, beloved by God and men, devoutly religious from his earliest youth, who attended the synagog every day, morning and evening, and always set aside some time for the study of the Torah. His house was open to

[6]Horovitz, Inschriften des Alten Friedhofs der Israelit'schen Gemeinde zu Frankfurt am Main. Frankfurt a. M. 1901, p. 194.

[7]Unna: Die Lemle-Moses Klaus-Stiftung. F. a. M. 1908.

every one who needed help, and was free of access to every student of the Torah, so that he was not only a lover of the Torah but a scholar himself and occupied a high position in the Jewish congregation.[8]

More prosaic is the tombstone inscription of Herz's son Moses,[9] who died Nov. 2, 1815, the last of the family to be buried in the old burying ground, which soon afterwards was closed. He is, however, mentioned also as a man of learning, of aristocratic descent, and as distinguished by strict honesty in his business dealings. Of his son Jacob Hirsch, who died in 1843, I know nothing. He is the father of Moses Schiff, whose son, Jacob H., was named for the grandfather. Moses, who died August 24, 1873, was a strictly observant Jew of that peculiar Frankfurt type that found its leader in Samson Raphael Hirsch. He is reputed as having valued highly the privilege of the family, which traces its descent to Aaron the high-priest, and to have proudly exercised this privilege by assisting, whenever he could, at the ceremony of the redemption of the first born son.[10] It might not be superfluous in our day to describe this ceremony a little more definitely. The law of the Pentateuch (Ex. 13, 13) demands that the first-born son be given to the priest, or be ransomed from him. Observant Jews still practice this ceremony today, and the supposed descendants of Aaron have the privilege of acquiring all the first-born sons, but leave it to the father to redeem his son for five silver pieces in the currency of the country. As far as historic records

[8]Horovitz, l. c., p. 414.

[9]Horovitz, l. c. 578.

[10]Der Israelit, 1873, p. 701.

show, no father has ever answered the question of the priest, whether he would rather hand him the son, or ransom him for five shekels, with the former alternative. Jacob H. Schiff's connection with rigid Frankfurt orthodoxy reaches into one generation later. His sister was married to Alfred Geiger, the son of the Frankfurt rabbi, Solomon Geiger (1792-1878), the latter the brother of the famous champion of reform, Abraham Geiger, but an entirely different type from him. Solomon Geiger was perhaps the last representative of old fashioned Frankfurt orthodoxy, reaching back into ghetto times. His son Alfred was a modern man in every respect, but a strictly observant Jew. It surely is not merely pedantry to see in these antecedents the mainspring of the devotion to Judaism, and of the peculiar conception of the future of American Jewry, which Jacob H. Schiff has manifested so strikingly by his large contributions to the New York Theological Seminary, and to educational institutions for the orthodox. He believes, and nobody can say that this belief is in itself illogical, that orthodox immigrants from Russia could develop into that type of orthodoxy, common in Frankfurt, which means men of good secular education, of high standing in the community, and perfect social manners, but who at the same time would be strictly observant Jews, going so far as refraining from carrying a handkerchief in their pockets on Sabbath.

The "Zekut Abot," the accumulated merits of a long line of ancestors, has certainly manifested itself in the case of Jacob H. Schiff. We possess in him

the type of the modern "Nagid." Like the Nagid of old who was close to the Khalif at Cordova, or to the Sultan at Cairo, Jacob H. Schiff has not considered his duty done by a princely generosity to charitable institutions, but he has with equal generosity endowed the cause of learning, not merely within the Jewish fold, but outside of it as well, for his generosity does not know the boundary line of race, creed, or nationality. It would be a work worthy the pride of an experienced author, to chronicle accurately the public and the private life of this prince in American Israel. No year passes that does not bring a record of hundreds of thousands of dollars spent for public purposes. At one time it is the acquisition of a collection of Oriental antiquities for Harvard; another time a Hebrew library for Washington; again the establishment of a commercial academy, not to speak of the Jewish Theological Seminary, which is practically his own foundation, and his generosity to th Hebrew Union College, to many Talmud Torahs, and finally his unequaled liberality to the cause of suffering humanity. The Frankfurter is as a rule proud of his home. There is a verse which runs somewhat like this: "Es geht mer net in Kopp erei, Wie kann denn a Mensch net von Frankfurt sei." The greatest son of the old imperial free city, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, says: "Edel sei der Mensch, hilfreich, and gut." None has acted on this advice better, nobler and with less ostentation than Jacob H. Schiff, for whose life and happiness in old age so many thousands of Americans, Jews and non-Jews alike, are now praying.

ONE GENERATION GOETH AND ANOTHER GENERATION COMETH.*

ON the 4th of June Prof. Jacob Freudenthal, the last to survive of my teachers at the Breslau Seminary, passed away. His demise vividly recalls to my mind the sad sentiment reflected in the words of Ecclesiastes, which form the title of this sketch. Freudenthal was 67 years old at the time of his death, and consequently not very much older than I am, but nevertheless he represents an earlier generation. He was the last one of the staff of the Breslau Seminary who taught by the side of its first principal, Zacharias Frankel, the man who left his imprint on the first German institution for the systematic training of rabbis. Frankel, who was born in 1801, understood very well the needs of Judaism in the era of transition. On one side there were, in his days, the faithful disciples of Moses Mendelssohn's bitter enemy, Ezekiel Landau; men like Eleazar Fleckeles and Frankel's teacher, Bezalel Ranschburg, officially called Daniel Rosenbaum. These were men who toned down the bitter opposition to all secularism represented by Ezekiel Landau, and were quite willing to accept the principles of this school, which advocated a spiritual amalgamation with their environment, being perfectly satisfied as long as traditional Jewish practices were maintained in the synagogue and in the household. On the other hand, there were those bitter rationalists, like Herz Homberg and

*Jewish Comment, July 19,1907.

Peter Beer, to whom rabbinism was a scarecrow. Frankel, therefore, knew intimately the men who had played an important part in the first struggle of the Jews to free themselves from the bondage of mediaevalism. And what a world separates us from the time of Moses Mendelssohn! Where is today the German manufacturer who would write a Hebrew book? Where is today the German public who would be eager to receive it? Who would today read German printed in Hebrew characters? Where is today the German rabbi, no matter how orthodox, who would oppose secular education? Thus the spiritual meaning of a generation forces itself upon our attention and justifies my attempt to recall Breslau Seminary as it was 30 years ago. What a wealth of information on the inner life of the Jews would we possess had the disciples of Rabbi Gershom of Mayence in the eleventh or of Meir of Rothenburg in the thirteenth century preserved to us their reminiscences! This justifies the expectation that no matter how commonplace my reminiscences may seem to be at present, they will at some time serve as historic documents.

On Saturday evening, October 7, 1876, I started for the academic life which awaited me in Breslau. There is an immense gap between the life of the high-school boy, the *gymnasiast*, and that of the university student in Germany. It is hard to convey the impression made on the mind of a young man when he becomes what is called an "academic citizen." We were now permitted to smoke on the street, while before we could only indulge in this pleasure in the privacy of our homes or in places beyond the city

limits which were not considered public. Our teachers who but yesterday had called us *Dummkopf* addressed us as *Herr*, and while hitherto there was no escape from cramming irregular Greek verbs, the meters of Horace and Sophocles, or the mysteries of analytic geometry, we now possessed full freedom to choose our studies, *Lernfreiheit.*

In my own case there was another big change. I had been reared in a small provincial town in Moravia. The longest journey I had previously made was from there to Nikolsburg, where I attended the gymnasium, a distance of about 20 miles. The largest city I had seen was Bruenn, the capital of Moravia, which at that time had at the utmost 80,000 inhabitants. Although it had not even a street car, it impressed me as quite metropolitan. But now I was to go to a foreign country. It required about 12 hours to reach Breslau, owing to the necessity of changing cars, while at present this city may be reached from Bruenn in five hours. To make this journey by myself as a boy of 17 was something which filled me with the consciousness that I had become the master of my own destiny. The railroad station of my native town was three miles from the city and father drove over there with me in the wagon of a Jewish peddler, who, when I saw him two years ago, still remembered this historic fact. It was a chilly autumn night and the feeling that I would be so far from home instead of being within the easy reach of three hours' travel by wagon made a pretty pathetic impression on me. This feeling was sharpened by the fact that my father,

whose only son I was, was deeply impressed by the emotion which my entering upon a career meant. He had lost five children, one sister and I being the only survivors, and therefore it was a religious sentiment which made him choose for me the rabbinical profession. I was his Samuel, "whom he had asked of the Lord." Another feature was the travel by night. A sleeper did not exist, and, in all likelihood, I would not have been permitted to pay first-class fare and the sleeping-car fare in addition if it had. I had to change cars in Bruenn about 11 o'clock at night, and in the morning when we reached Oderberg, the border station, I saw a customhouse for the first time, and passed, for the first time, the boundary lines of my native country.

The different uniforms and various other features of Prussian officialdom impressed me as something novel. I remember also how at one station on the Prussian side some people wanted to board the train just as the gong had sounded for the third time, and while the train had not yet started, the conductor slammed the doors and shouted "*Abfahrt*! *S'Alle*!" —an experience which showed the severe discipline of Prussia. I am quite sure that in such cases a conductor in Austria would have allowed the passengers to board the train. I remember also the inconvenience which I underwent trying to lay *Tefillin*. The blessing in this case of slow railroad travel proved a godsend, for at Kosel, where we were forced to change cars and had to wait 20 minutes or so for connection I repaired to a lonely place near the station and performed my devotional exercises.

Another experience which I vividly recall as humiliating was that some of my fellow-travelers, having learned that I came from Austria, belittled my country which I had always been taught to love so dearly in all the addresses delivered on the birthdays of the Emperor and Empress, on their saints' days and on similar occasions. The events of 1866, when Austria was defeated in the war with Prussia, and of 1871, when Germany had triumphed over France, were still so recent that the people could not get tired of exhibiting their patriotic joy.

It was about noon when I arrived in Breslau, where, according to my orders and the information which I had received, I took a cab which should bring me to the Jewish hotel, the *Goldenes Hirschl*, in the Karlsstrasse. It was, of course, highly necessary to guard a boy against people who might rob him of the $10 he possessed. The *Goldenes Hirschl* was one of those old structures of ancient Breslau which are known from the vivid descriptions found in Freytag's *Soll und Haben* and in Auerback's *Dichter und Kaufman.* I believe I paid three thalers, of $2.20 per month for my room.

It was with a feeling of great expectation that on the same afternoon I made my way to the seminary, which was situated a short distance from my hotel. The seminary is a plain apartment building, just like a number of others on the same street. It is situated on the *Wallstrasse*, which, as the name indicates, is built on the site of the former city fortifications. Right near that spot a terrible powder explosion took place in 1749, which destroyed several lives and of

which Lessing speaks in "*Die Juden*," one of his early plays, quoting an anti-Semite who saw the finger of Providence in the fact that so many Jews were the victims of the disaster. It is not located exactly in the Jewish quarter, but right near it. A plain four-story building, it would be taken for a plain apartment house, such as are found everywhere in Germany, were it not for the inscription over its entrance "*Juedisch Theologisches Seminar, Fraenckel'sche Stiftung.*" When, in 1806, Breslau was captured by the French with very little effort, it was recognized that the fortifications were useless, and consequently the King donated them to the city, under the condition that they sould be turned into a public park. Therefore, Breslau has a beautiful promenade surrounding the whole city and encircled by the old Stadtgraben, which connects with the Oder River. The seminary has not only a very nice little garden but also the advantage of adjoining the promenade. On the first floor there was a flat occupied by Dr. Rosin. On the other side of the entrance there were three lecture-rooms, of which, however, only two were needed. On the second floor lived the Direktor, then Dr. Frankel's successor, and some rooms were set apart for a library. On the third floor lived Dr. Graetz, one side of the flat having been turned into a modest hall, which was used as a synagogue, the back portion being screened off so as to form a partition for the women. On the third floor there were two flats, one occupied by Dr. Zuckermann and the other by Dr. Freudenthal, and, finally, there were two attic rooms, where two students had free quarters, it being their

duty to attend synagogue services daily which, however, it may be said right here, they often neglected to do. At the entrance of every flat there was a porcelain doorplate, with the name of its inhabitant and his *Sprechstunde*. Thus, furnished with the obligatory kid gloves and my first silk hat, which I think now must have looked rather comical on a boy of 17, I made my calls. I do not remember in which order I made the calls, and therefore I will describe my impressions, beginning with the ground floor. Dr. Rosin was then a man of 53. He represented more than anyone of his colleagues, the type of a German *Schulmeister*, quiet and deliberate in his address, very prompt in the performance of his duties, and very exact both in writing and in teaching, so that the boys, among themselves, often poked fun at his habits. He would for instance, in reading Biblical commentaries, quoting several times in the same hour R. S. B. M., add each time the explanation that this stands for Rabbi Samuel ben Meir, the grandson of Rashi—a fact which, as conditions were then, it was hardly necessary to state once. At the same time he was of a very kindly disposition and filled with a fatherly love for his students, and I may proudly say that I enjoyed the distinction of being amongst his favorites, exchanging letters with him until the time of his death. His wife was the type of a German *gouvernante*, with blonde hair done up in tresses on each side, just as we see in the portraits of 50 years ago, for instance in the picture of Annette von Droste-Huelshoff. She was of a motherly disposition, and therefore called by the boys *Mamachen*, as

Dr. Rosin called her himself. Sometimes he would interpose a friendly rebuke when she inquired into the affairs of the students, which he did not think she ought to do. I remember the following incident distinctly: No one was allowed to preach at the homiletic exercises until he had passed two years in the academic department. As a rule, students would readily avail themselves of this privilege as soon as the probationary period was over, but I, for a reason which I cannot now explain to myself, did not care to do so. Thus when my fifth semester had arrived Mrs. Rosin said to me: "Herr Deutsch, why don't you preach?" And the Doctor, in his usual quiet way, said: "*Mamachen*, you must not be too inquisitive. Such questions the gentlemen have to settle with themselves." While a highly educated woman, who possessed a teacher's certificate, she was very proud of her culinary achievements, and a compliment on her desert would make her radiant with joy Naturally, any suggestion as to a flaw in her household would provoke her very seriously, and I remember the following: One Friday evening, having been invited to supper, I asked Dr. Rosin about a difficult passage in Rabbi Samuel ben Meir's commentary on the Pentateuch, a favorite book of his, which he later on, in 1880, published from the unique manuscript in possession of the Breslau Seminary, Dr. Rosin had, in this respect, the characteristics of a sound scholar, and, no matter how well he might know the subject, he would never venture to give an opinion without careful investigation. So he took from the shelf this manuscript, which he had borrowed from

the library, and before opening it he blew the dust from the top. *Mamachen* seemed to be quite indignant at this slur upon her domestic virtues, and in a tone which showed how deeply she smarted under this stab, she said: "You need not remove any dust; the books are dusted every day, and every Friday the shelves are cleaned." The Doctor, who, engrossed in the scientific question, evidently did not notice how seriously she took the matter, and said: "Why, books will always be dusty." Then *Mamachen* arose to a higher pitch and said: "There can positively be no dust on those books when I dusted them myself, with the aid of the servant, taking every book singly from the shelf." Then Dr. Rosin awoke to the seriousness of the occasion, and said with a smile: "Well, *Mamachen*, I merely wanted to show Mr. Deutsch that in our house you cannot remove any dust from the books even if you blow at them right hard." *Mamachen*, of course, was overjoyed. Their family consisted of one son, Heinrich, now professor of the medical department of the Berlin University. On him both parents bestowed infinite care, and they were privileged to see him become a promising physician. The last time I saw them was in 1891, a few months before I came to America. Dr. Rosin, who was advised of my coming, called at my hotel in the morning following upon my arrival. I was deeply touched by the kindness of the old gentleman, who was then near his seventieth year. His wife was afflicted with serious heart trouble, and he strained all efforts to keep excitement away from her, and therefore he asked me to decline all invitations to

stay for a meal, because he felt that his wife might exert herself too much in providing for a guest. Not long afterwards she died, and he followed her within two years, dying December 31, 1894. He had on the same day addressed his colleague, Israel Levy, on the occasion of his silver wedding, and during his speech fell ill, was brought to his rooms, where he died a few hours later. His exactness is characterized by the fact that among his papers was found an address for the graduation exercises, which are held at the seminary on the 27th of January. Thus he showed himself a model of attachment to duty in death as in life.

REMINISCENCES OF THE BRESLAU SEMINARY: LEYSER LAZARUS.*

AT a mock trial held by the Alumni Association of the Hebrew Union College during the last rabbinical conference at Frankfort, Mich., I was convicted of waning memory. I am afraid that the compliment conveyed by this charge is not fully merited. My memory is not as reliable in details as I would like to have it. At all events, I do not remember in what succession I presented myself at the *Sprechstunde* of the various professors, and therefore I shall describe them according to their location. On the second floor *Eine Treppe Hoch* there lived, as became his dignity, the president, Dr. Lazarus, the *Herr Direktor*. In Germany the second floor is the most aristocratic part of the house, and as in Germany almost all houses are apartment-houses, it is occupied by the socially most prominent. The Herr Direktor was, from the point of view of literary fame, the least known of the faculty. As far as my knowledge goes, his only literary work is a treatise on the ethics of the Talmud, published with the annual report of the Seminary in 1877. He certainly did not compare in any way, as far as his standing in the world of learning goes, with his predecessor, Frankel, nor with the most renowned member of the faculty, Professor Graetz.

Leyser Lazarus was born in Filehne, Posen, in 1820, frequented the Yeshibah of Akiba Eger in

*Jewish Comment, August 16, 1907.

Posen, and some time after the latter's death went to Sondershausen, where he acted as tutor in Talmudic lore to Rabbi Phillip Heidenheim. He was thus enabled to attend the gymnasium and to receive secular education. Phillip Heidenheim, who died June 14, 1906, on his 92d birthday, was a most remarkable survival of that period when the princes of small German States acted on the principle that they were the instruments of Providence for the promotion of the welfare of the Jews. The Prince of Schwarzburg-Sondershausen, one of the smallest German States, was a special type of this kind. He resolved to give to those of his subjects professing the Jewish religion a sort of hierarchy, and made Philip Heidenheim, who was up to that time, a teacher in the Jewish school, the Landrabbiner of the principality, in order that he might be able to make a decent livelihood. Thus he combined in his person the offices of religious teacher, preacher, Landrabbiner and professor of mathematics and German at the Realschule. At one time he also held the office of Landrabbiner in the neighboring principality of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, and conducted a boarding-school besides. Though all these activities yielded him only a modest income, still he lived to be 92 years old and preserved his mental faculties to the end. When he was appointed Landrabbiner he required somebody to coach him in Talmudic lore, and for this purpose he engaged L. Lazarus, who at some later period sent for his brother Moritz, who afterwards became a famous philosopher.

Lazarus was in 1849 elected rabbi of Prenzlau, and remained in this position until 1875, when he was called to the presidency of the Breslau Seminary.

During that whole time he never came prominently before the public, either in literary activity or in communal work. He devoted himself exclusively to the limited duties of the rabbinical position in a small German community and to Talmudic studies. In the latter he attained a prominence which a generation before would have made him one of the leading men of the profession, a *Charif*, as they used to say. In this respect an anecdote which he liked to tell himself is very illustrative of his position. It once happened that a Polish Jew had some business in Prenzlau and remained there over the Sabbath. Not being otherwise occupied, he spent most of the day in the house of the rabbi, discussing Talmudic subjects. Great was his surprise to see that a rabbi who spoke German and whose beard was partly clipped, and who wore a robe when he went to the synagogue, should prove himself as good a Talmudist as any Polish rabbi with beard and *Peies*, dressed in a gaberdine and knowing no other language but Yiddish. The following Sunday the confirmation of some girls was celebrated in the synagogue, and in the evening a marriage was solemnized there. The *Pollak* attended both these functions, and, taking leave of the rabbi afterwards, said to him: "You should come to us in Poland. There you could be a rabbi. But here, what are you? A *Melamed* (Sabbath-school teacher) and a *Marshalik* (buffoon)!" In Poland it is the buffoon alone who delivers an address at the wedding ceremony.

From these remarks it is evident that Lazarus was a peculiar phenomenon, a rather unique combination of the rabbi of the old type—whose only

ambition it was to be a great Talmudist and a man of modern culture. His Talmudic lectures, therefore, excelled in their keen dialecticism. He especially delighted in the methods of the latest rabbinical school belonging to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These works are so remote from our present way of thinking that it will be exceedingly difficult to give to a modern public an idea of their nature. The general principle of dialectics is an artificial harmonization of real or apparent contradictions in rabbinic literature based on the principle that the whole Thorah is one, and that there can be no contradiction between its representatives. The Jewish soul is characterized by its childlike veneration of the past, and consequently any idea found in an old work is above criticism. On the other hand, this submission to old authorities seems to lead to a certain delight in showing independence of younger authorities, and so, from Talmudic times on, the distinction between old authorities, *Rishonim*, and younger authorities, *Aharonim*, is constantly accentuated. There is also no doubt but that a structure erected on an unsafe foundation will become the shakier the higher it is built. When modern culture entered into the life of the Jew, he felt more offended by the dialecticism of the later rabbis than by that of a former generation. Consequently he was more apt to emancipate himself from the ideas propounded by men of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries than by those of the middle ages. Of my early teachers, my father was especially a type of this era of transition. He liked to dwell on the intricacies of the

dialectics of the Tosafists, the French authors of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. He was especially fond of Rabbi Nissim of Gerona, and would also consider some men of the sixteenth century, like Samuel Edels, and even occasionally, Judah Rosanes of the seventeenth, the author of *Mishneh Lamelek*, as sound thinkers; but later authors, including the great rabbis of the eighteenth century, like Jakob Joshua, Aryeh Loew of Metz and Ezekiel Landau, were considered representatives of a degeneracy in Talmudic studies, although reverence forbade expressly saying so.

When I came to Breslau, and first attended Dr. Lazarus' lectures, I was bewildered by the fact that these later authors were treated so extensively, and especially was I astonished to hear so frequently the name of Abika Eger, whom the *Herr Direktor* called Reb Kive. It is quite possible that I did not even know the name of Akiba Eger in those days. At all events, if I did, I knew no more than the name, and when he quoted a *Reb Kive* I naturally thought of the Talmudic teacher, Rabbi Akiba, and felt quite astonished that such intricate arguments should have been advanced by this teacher of the second century. Being younger than my colleagues of the upper grade in the Talmudic class, and not having had the advantage of a Yeshibah education, and therefore knowing my inferiority, I was ashamed to express my astonishment, and so it took a long time before I knew that this *Reb Kive* who had said such wondrously intricate things was a rabbi who had lived 40 years ago. Perhaps there was a local

patriotism underlying this aversion to the greatness of *Akiba Eger*. Men of that type possess a merely local significance. I knew of Rabbi Mordecai Benet, the chief Rabbi of Nikolsburg, where I attended the gymnasium 30 odd years after his death, and naturally was impressed by the stories of his saintly life and even of his miracles. although the latter were considered legendary. Of Akiba Eger I may have never heard a word. At all events I did not see the necessity for knowing exactly what he had said, especially when his arguments offended our sense of logic or appeared ridiculously small. As an instance I shall quote the discourse whether a man who has been seen in a barbershop could be considered a reliable witness in a matrimonial case, which Rabbi Akiba answers affirmatively, because the witness against the sinner could not testify that they had seen the man actually being shaved, but had seen him merely in a barber's chair with soap on his face and a towel around his neck. On the basis of which Rabbi Akiba decided that the man may, in the last moment, have repented of his evil intentions and never have committed a sin which would stamp him as a wicked man, whose testimony could not be relied upon. Dr. Lazarus did not like such criticisms, and I remember distinctly how the otherwise calm man grew excited at O. H. Schorr, the Galician infidel, who had ridiculed the works of Eger and his contemporaries.

The greatest difficulty in making Jewish literature understood by people who are not scholars in the technical sense of the word, lies in finding a method of

giving them an idea of Talmudic dialecticism, and therefore the reader will have to have patience when I try to give him a proper insight into the Talmudic courses of Dr. Lazarus. One of his favorite topics which I still remember was the discourse of Joseph Fraenkel of Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, better known by the name of his work, "Peri Megadim," on a point in the dietary laws. According to the Talmud, an animal with a shrunken liver is trefa, unless an olive's size of the liver remains. Later authorities, into whose opinions I cannot enter in detail, demand, because of some exegetic difficulty in the Talmudic words, three olives' sizes of the liver left, every one in a different place. Consequently, the difficulty arises. If there were three animals, each one having a shrunken liver, and in each case one olive's size being left in the place prescribed by the various authorities, so that it would be certain that of the three animals two must be kosher, and if now the meat of these three animals were mixed would it be kosher or not? Lazarus who spoke very slowly and with a nasal drawl, delighted in presenting these intricacies. I can still see his smile as he looked upon his class, being sure that the students must be enraptured with the brilliancy of these *chakirehs*, and to imagine what we, or at least I, felt on such occasions the reader must not forget that we were introduced to the *chakirehs* of Kant and Mommsen, and then it can be easily imagined in whose favor the comparison resulted.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that Lazarus was a fine pedagogue. We had already then

quite a number of poor Talmudists among our students. Those who had not received the advantages of a Yeshibah education or who were not as fortunate as I was in being trained by a father who was a Talmudic scholar, had a hard time following these lectures, and I could tell some very amusing stories in this respect about some of my colleagues, were it not that the point would be missed by most of my readers; but even the poor Talmudists understood the dialectical principles expounded by Dr. Lazarus. Thus the very intricate question, in which case one may incur by one act two or more punishments, which is done, for instance, by one who is Levitically unclean, if he were to eat the fat of holy meat on the third day after the sacrifice, this day being Yom Kippur. The principles underlying such decisions are expounded by Maimonides in his commentary on the Mishnah (Keritot, 13, b), and I still remember how I astonished Reb Judah Brunner the dayan in Pohrlitz, when I called on him during vacation and our conversation turned on this point, and I was able to quote this view of Maimonides. Later on he told my father how glad he was to see that they do learn something in these seminaries, after all. Reb Judah, who died about 10 years ago in very advanced years, was a most unique character for our times. He had been a student, attending with my father the Yeshibah of his native town in the early 30s. In my days he kept a second-hand shop, and was at the same time assistant rabbi of his congregation, highly respected by everybody in spite of his business, which would hardly be compatible with a

rabbinical position in the United States. When I called on him it was a Friday of the Pessach week, and Reb Judah was sitting in his basement shop, enjoying his frugal meal of coffee and Mazos, for on Friday he would not take any substantial meal, in order to preserve his appetite for the evening. While we were discussing the question of the poor sinner who by eating one bite would incur several punishments, aggregating to 195 lashes, a farmer came in to buy a pair of trousers. What the price was I cannot exactly remember, but I know that the customer made a bid of 95 kreuzer—about 40 cents. But Reb Judah, in the same tone in which he discussed Maimonides and Rabbi Nissim, said curtly: "*Nein, Her Vetter*, for 95 kreuzer I have no pants." I wish I could have had a phonograph and a camera to reproduce this fine scene, of which I have tried to give a picture in my novel "*Unloesbare Fesseln.*"

Needless to say, my father was highly elated when Reb Judah made these complimentary remarks to him. But I must return to my original subject. Dr. Lazarus was of a very kind and peaceful disposition, and enjoyed the unrestricted love and respect of all his students. Once a year, on Purim, Herr Direktor gave a reception, to which all the members of the faculty and the students were invited. Mrs. Lazarus, who was much younger than her husband and celebrated her 70th birthday recently, was a highly-talented lady, and graced such occasions by some poetical contributions. In one instance it was a little play, in which all of the members of the faculty were humorously complimented. Most of us

were socially awkward, as is natural for young men brought up in small towns and modest circumstances. Only a few knew how to dance, and the pious old people of Breslau severely shook their heads when they spoke of the fact that future rabbis indulged in such a pleasure, which, according to the undisputed views of Hayim Shor (Torat Hayim, Lublin, 1608, Abodah Zarah, 17), would surely land a man in hell. In all other respects, however, our conduct was strictly orthodox. I remember how it shocked me to see one of my colleagues, an American, open a letter on the Sabbath, but even he took his meals in a kosher restaurant. The classes in Hebrew were attended by the students with covered head, and even the late Privy Councillor, Prof. Freudenthal, had a little velvet cap, which he put on his head when he read to us from Maimonides' Moreh. At my entrance examination I had to interpret Psalm 64, and Dr. Rosin, who examined me with uncovered head, put on his skull-cap before pronouncing the Hebrew word *vayorem*, which I was to explain grammatically. Professor Graetz, the Parnass of our synagogue, came not only on Sabbath, but on every week-day, when the Torah was being read. He also always laid Tefillin. Services on week-days were not attended by the members of the faculty, except by Dr. Zuckerman, who was a pious soul, and went every day, morning and evening, to a little synagogue established by his father in a house still owned by him, which was situated at some distance from the seminary. I shall, however, speak more on this point elsewhere.

Lazarus was always in delicate health. It evidently would have been better for him to have remained rabbi of a small provincial town, where his duties were less exacting, and, in all likelihood, less exciting. His position must have had its difficulties. Graetz, as a man of international fame, naturally could not forget that he had not been selected as president of the institution. He never referred to Lazarus as Herr Direktor, but always as Dr. Lazarus. Only on one occasion did he make an exception. This was on the 27th of January, 1879, when, in the absence of Lazarus, who was already quite a sick man, he presided over the graduation exercises, and naturally had to refer to the regrettable fact that our beloved Herr Direktor was prevented from taking the customary part on this occasion, but one could notice that the "Herr Direktor" fairly choked him. Lazarus died soon afterwards, April 16, 1879, at the age of 58. He therefore held his office only a little more than three years, and the feelings of Graetz were spared afterwards, inasmuch as no Direktor was appointed, the professor of Talmud being given the rather unique title of *Seminar Rabbiner*, while the presidency alternated annually amongst the faculty. It may be of particular interest to note that in the first year of his presidency Lazarus conditioned one of the graduates in Talmud, and that this graduate is at present one of the greatest Jewish scholars and authors. Thus in his tenure of office the conflict between the old rabbinical idea that the rabbi must be an expert in the rabbinical law, and the modern idea which demands that he be a master of Jewish literature, was exempli-

fied. I believe that this gentleman, whose essays were then already published in the records of the Vienna Academy, or in the Zeitschrift der Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft, smiled then at this peculiar notion, and today the world would smile at the fact that this briliant man should have been considered unfit for receiving the rabbinical diploma.

FREUDENTHAL AND THE BRESLAU SEMINARY.*

IT seems that minorities lack self-confidence. At all events, this is remarkably evident in the case of the Jews. Any man rises in the eyes of his coreligionists as soon as he attains a position of any consequence in the outside world. I called attention to this in a former article, when I pointed out the fact that Graetz, the Jewish nationalist, puts on the title page of his works his position as honorary professor at the Breslau University and neglects to state his connection with the Breslau Seminary, which really was his life's position. The cases of two colleagues of his are similar. Jakob Bernays, the son of Isaac Bernays, who was the real founder of what may be termed neo-orthodoxy, was one of the first members of the faculty of the Breslau Seminary in 1854. He was, at the same time, *Privatdocent* of classic philology, and as soon as he obtained a professorship at the University of Bonn, he left his former place for a new field. He was a strictly observant Jew, and one would have thought that a man of his type would have been glad of an opportunity to devote himself to specifically Jewish subjects and to take part in the training of Jewish ministers. Evidently this was not the case.

Freudenthal succeeded Bernays in 1864. He was then a young man of 28. He had been a student of the Breslau Seminary, but did not graduate, and took

*Jewish Comment November 8, 1907.

to teaching. In 1864 he was called back to his alma mater as professor of philosophy in the academic and of philology in the lower department. This requires an explanation, and at the same time sheds light on the evolution of Jewish learning in modern times. When the seminary was opened in 1854 it was feared that it would not attract enough attention from students who had received a regular high-school training. Even this is characteristic. It was considered a self-degredation for any young man who had a chance to become a doctor, a lawyer or even, if conditions were improved, a governmental official to enter the rabbinate. I myself remember that in 1876, when I graduated from the *Gymnasium* in Nikolsburg, where at that time every store was, and perhaps still is, kept closed on the Sabbath, my friends considered it a craze on my part that I should devote myself to rabbinical studies. Typical of these conditions is the fact that a cousin of my father's, a woman who would not miss *Schul* on a weekday of any significance, such as on Selichoth or during the ten days of penitance, tried to dissuade me from entering the service of Judaism. We were then in the height of liberalism. In Nikolsburg, where up to 1873 the *Gymnasium* was controlled by a Catholic order, the Piarists, a Jew had, in 1873, been appointed professor of history. To be a professor at a gymnasium, with a life tenure, and receiving a salary of $500, rising to $800, was a dream for Jewish parents when they thought of the future of their children, no matter how much these good people respected their rabbis, the successors of Heine's *Tauvess Jontef*,

they would rather see their sons professors at a gymnasium than rabbis of Nikolsburg, or even of Prague.

I can notice a similar feature in our modern seminaries. A member of the teaching staff in one of these European institutions is certainly supposed to conform with the Jewish law, but, in the case of David H. Mueller of Vienna or Ignaz Goldziher of Budapest, nobody would dream of taking umbrage at their public violation of the Sabbath or dietary laws. Both are university professors, the former even a court councillor, and it is considered a condescension on their part to remain Jews and to be connected with Jewish institutions.

With Freudenthal it was something similar. As soon as he became extraordinary professor he ceased teaching philological branches in the preparatory course of the seminary, and as soon as he became a regular professor he resigned from the seminary altogether. This requires a two-fold explanation. As said before, it was considered improbable that a sufficient number of regular high-school graduates would devote themselves to rabbinical studies. Consequently it was expected that most of the students would come from the *Yeshibahs* and would have to be prepared for entrance examinations into the university. This had actually been the case in former years, and to some extent, still in my time. Therefore provision was made for instruction in secular branches. Some of the students, having received this instruction for several years, went to the *Gymnasium* to pass their *Abiturientenexamen*. Others were, upon a certificate from some professor, admitted as "extraordinary

hearers," which sufficed to allow them to receive the Ph.D. degree, and this was finally all that the congregations demanded, for—here is another instance of the Jewish lack of self-confidence—no one can be considered a rabbi in Germany, Austria or the United States without being a doctor. It was due to this psychological condition that the young men who studied in this preparatory course always considered themselves discriminated against, whether rightly or wrongly I do not know, although it would seem to me that the latter was the case, for we students who had been drawn to the institution by our love for the calling were so romantic that we considered our secular education as something inferior.

Another explanation has to be given to the American readers with regard to the general practices of German universities. A man who wishes to enter upon an academic career "habilitates" himself as "*Privatdocent*," which means that he receives from his department "*facultaet*" the right to give courses. He does not draw a salary, and what he receives in fees from the students never amounts to anything of consequence. From the ranks of these *Privatdocenten* professors are usually, but not necessarily, chosen. In the course of their promotion they are first made "extraordinary" professors, which means that they occupy a position for which no definite provision is made in the constitution of the university, and their last step is the promotion to the rank of regular (ordinary) professor. Freudenthal was *Privatdocent* when I came to Breslau and was quite popular already. As such he must have entered upon his career in

1874 or 1875. There were besides him three professors of philosophy—William Dilthey, now still professor at the University of Berlin, and especially popular as a writer; Friedrich Weber, who later on became bishop of the Old Catholic Church, and at that time drew immense crowds by his public lectures against the papal policy, the struggle between Church and State being then at its height; and, finally, there was an old man, who had long outlived his usefulness, called Johann Peter Elvenich, a type of the German professor as you see him portrayed in the *Fliegende Blaetter*, smooth-shaven, except for a little streak of beard on his cheeks, a high standing collar whose points reached almost to his mouth, with eyeglasses and always wearing a silk hat on his head and an umbrella under his arm.

In 1878 Freudenthal received his appointment as extraordinary professor, and, naturally, we at once changed our mode of addressing him, and he changed the inscription on his porcelain doorplate to Prof. Dr. J. Freudenthal. It was about 1883, when I had left the seminary, that his turn came to be promoted to the rank of regular professor, when Dilthey left for Berlin and anti-Semitism had already made considerable progress. The Government hesitated. The University of Breslau was originally a Catholic institution, and, therefore, according to the constitution, one professor of philosophy had to be a Catholic. The Government therefore decided that the other chair could be held only by a Protestant, and so it was not until 1885 that Freudenthal received his appointment to the rank of regular professor. As a

striking illustration of Jewish conditions, on which I touched before, I point to the fact that Friedrich Weber resigned his position as professor in order to become bishop of the Old Catholic Church, while Freudenthal severed his connection with the seminary when he was raised to the rank of regular professor.

In appearance Freudenthal was the type of north German—blonde, tall, lank, his head slightly drooping and always dignified. Very rarely did he get excited. I remember only one instance, when one of the students, Abraham Chotiner, who died a year after his graduation as rabbi of Chemnitz, kept on discussing a certain point during Freudenthal's lectures on Maimonides. It was evident that Freudenthal did not like to see the manners of the *Beth Hamidrash* lectures transferred to his lecture-room. At the seminary he lectured on Jewish philosophers, reading and explaining the text in Hebrew translation, and on Alexandrian Jewish philosophy, and in the preparatory department he taught biblical books and Greek. In the university his lectures had no connection with Judaism. In the first year that I came he taught Kant's philosophy, and there, as in his courses on Alexandrian philosophy, he rather overwhelmed us with his mass of information on details. It was not particularly his fault, but the fault of the German university system, which leads the freshman into courses for which he is not adequately prepared. That, in spite of this fact, the German universities are at the head of the world's educational institutions merely seems to prove that lack of pedagogic system does not hamper the development of gifted individuals.

In his religious life Freudenthal was then strictly observant. He attended the synagogue of the seminary regularly on Friday evenings and Saturday mornings. During the first year that I was in Breslau he lost his mother and recited Kaddish regularly. Being a Kohen, he recited the blessing on holy days (*Duchan*), chanting the traditional tunes. We were invited to his house once a year on Friday evenings. He made Kiddush and said the grace after meal. Prof. David Simonsen, now retired chief rabbi of Copenhagen, and then student at the seminary, told me that Freudenthal scrupulously laid *Tefillin* every morning. By and by the matter changed. By younger colleagues I was told that in later years, when Freudenthal was professor at the university and gave an annual dinner to his seminar class, the bill of fare contained things which were not in accordance with the Jewish dietary laws, and one of my American friends, who three years ago visited Germany and wished to see Dr. Freudenthal, was told by Rabbi Guttmann of Breslau that he should not do it, as Freudenthal was not in sympathy with Jewish institutions. How much in this is mere conjecture I, of course, am unable to know. The last time I saw him, which was about 20 years ago, he did not show this, but received me very cordially, and when, about seven years ago, I wrote to him in the interest of the Jewish Encyclopedia, he also answered very cordially, although he declined to take part in the work on the ground that his time was fully occupied. His household was a very pleasant one, consisting in my time of a wife and three small children, the oldest of whom is now professor of

law in the academy of Frankfort a. M. His wife is the daughter of the late Rabbi Michael Sachs of Berlin, and was, therefore, raised in a strictly orthodox environment, her brother being one of the most prominent leaders in the conservative Judaism of Berlin, and another near relation of hers, Dr. Lehfeld, a strictly observant Jew, who, in spite of his large medical practice, never wrote a prescription or rode in any conveyance on the Sabbath. Mrs. Freudenthal, however, is said —and this I have on very good authority—to have participated in her husband's cold attitude toward all things Jewish.

It may be considered remarkable that Jewish theology has contributed so much to the study of philosophy. We had, and partly still have, amongst prominent professors of philosophy in the German universities men like Lazarus, Freudenthal, Hermann Cohen in Marburg and Ludwig Stein in Bern, of whom the last named was rabbi of a Berlin congregation and the others at least theological students. Stein is a graduate of Hildesheimer's orthodox seminary, and Cohen, so Guedemann told me, was at the point of leaving Breslau in 1861, when Samson R. Hirsch made his attacks on Frankel's introduction into the Mishnah. He has overcome his scruples since.

ISAAC HIRSCH WEISS.*

THE Austrian province of Moravia has a peculiar history. It numbered, according to the last census, 41,000 Jews, constituting less than two per cent of the population, and showed a declining tendency, having lost during the last decade about 3,000. It scarcely had at any period of its history a larger population, for the law in force up to 1848 restricted the right to marry to 5,400 "Familianten." Despite this smallness of numbers, the Jewry of Moravia has distinguished itself in Jewish literature. Leaving aside the rabbinic authors of olden times, whose names are taken from Moravian congregations such as Austerlitz, Boskowitz, Eibenschuetz, Kunitz, Nikolsburg, etc., we have quite a galaxy of Moravians in modern Jewish literature. Aaron Chorin, the first officiating rabbi who was a determined champion of Reform, was a native of Weisskirchen in Moravia. His disciple, Leopold Loew, next to Geiger the most prominent Jewish theologian of the 19th century, was the son af a Moravian village Jew. So was Adolph Jellinek, the powerful preacher and versatile scholar. Prossnitz is the home of the most learned and most prolific writer on Jewish literature in all its branches, Moritz Steinschneider. Of the younger generation, David Kaufman and Nehemias Bruell, both of whom died before they had completed their 50th year, left an honored and lasting name on our records. The most popular writer, a man who exer-

*The American Israelite, March 11, 1915.

cised a far reaching influence on the students of Hebrew literature, was Isaac Hirsch Weiss, born at Gross-Meseritsch, March 1, 1815.

Weiss, at the age of 80, wrote his autobiography, but in this, as in most instances, the real biography of a Jewish scholar is an appreciation of his works. Gross-Meseritsch, which by the way is also the birthplace of the distinguished American educator, Samuel Wolfenstein, and has been immortalized in the "Maritz" of the beautiful sketches of Ghetto life written by the lamented Martha Wolfenstein, was a Kehillah of 151 families. Like other old congregations in that section of the country, it lost most of its Jewish inhabitants when freedom of residence was granted to the Austrian Jews. Weiss was the son of plain, and according to the local rating, well-to-do parents, who gave him the education, then common amongst Jews, sending him to the Heder where he also received the elements of a secular education. The opposition to the latter was at no time very strong in Moravia, and Meseritsch distinguished itself by having a rabbi, Tobias Levit, who as early as 1808 published a Hebrew text book of mathematics.[1] Without any ceremony, and without having to finish any defined curriculum, a promising boy graduated from the Heder to the Yeshibah, where his sole occupation was the study of the Talmud, though no one seems to have objected, if the boy, in his leisure hours, tried to improve his education by reading German books. A custom, which is mentioned in the Talmud as early as the second century in the case of Judah Hanasi, (Yer. Pesahim, 3, 7), demanded that a

[1] ברורי המדות, Prague, 1808.

young man should be sent away from home to continue his studies, and so Weiss was sent to Eisenstadt in Hungary to attend the Yeshibah of Moses Perls (1784-1854), a native of Ungarisch-Brod in Moravia, a town also used very frequently as family name of Jewish authors in the form of "Broda." Perls represented a more liberal type of rabbinical scholarship than the average Hungarian rabbi of the Pressburg school.[2] His grandson, Armin, who died in September, 1914, as rabbi of Fuenfkirchen, was one of the first students of the Hochschule of Berlin. The Yeshibah was not considered a professional school for the training of rabbis. It was a Jewish high school or college of liberal arts. When the young man was old enough to consider his education completed, he married and in the majority of cases started on a business career. Such was the case of Isaac Hirsch Weiss. He returned to his native city, married the daughter of Rabbi Baer Oppenheim of Eibenschuetz[3] (1790-1859) and engaged in business. His wife could trace her descent back to David Oppenheim,[4] the famous bibliophile, who died as rabbi of Prague in 1736, and was the nephew of the famous court Jew, Samuel Oppenheimer, (1630-1702), the Rothschild of his day. Meyerbeer, the illustrious composer, is also a member of this family.

Weiss' enterprise in business was that of theJews in his section of the country. They traded in the villages, buying the products of the country, which consisted chiefly of wool, flax, and glue, and according

[2]Grunwald: פארי חכמי מדינתנו p. 106, M. Sziget, 1910.
[3]Jewish Encycl, IX, 409.
[4]ib. 410.

to the testimony of his contemporaries given to me personally, he was a very shrewd business man. Nevertheless, he was not successful as such, and so to him may be applied the Talmudic adage[5] that his failure was his success. He had already, while engaged in business, done some literary work for the Hebrew periodical, "Kokebe Yizhak," published since 1845 in Vienna, edited by Mendel Stern, a native of Pressburg. Judaism of western Austria was in those days about in a period of cultural development which is at present seen in Poland and Lithuania. To write elegant Hebrew avoiding the punning habit of old rabbinic literature was the highest accomplishment. Times have changed considerably. Weiss, when compelled to fall back on his learning for a livelihood, went to Vienna and obtained a position as supervisor of the Hebrew department in a printing establishment, being employed among others as proof-reader for the Talmud, published by Jacob Schlossberg, a native of Wilna, who in 1886 met a tragic death, being assassinated by a desperado without cause. Weiss also published a prayer book, and edited the "Sifra" in 1864. In the latter he proved himself a disciple of the scientific school which had superseded the old ideal of rabbinic casuistry. He also contributed to an interesting controversy which then agitated the Jewish circles of Austria and Germany.

The matter is a mere incident in the life and literary activity of Weiss, but possesses an interest of a more general nature, and therefore shall be briefly presented. Since the collapse of the reactionary

[5]Ta'anit, 17, a, see: Mishnah Hallah, 2, 5.

policy of Austria after the unfortunate war with Italy in 1859, the liberal movement made rapid progress. As always is the case, reactionary forces die hard. Clericalism allied with feudalism was not ready to yield, though for the present reduced to the defensive. Its most popular champion was Sebastian Brunner,[6] a priest, who with considerable literary ability, edited the Vienna Kirchenzeitung. An important part of his policy was to attack the Jews. A special opportunity came to him in a peculiar way. Graetz wrote an essay under the title, "Die Verjuengung Des Juedischen Stammes," for the yearbook appearing in Vienna, and published by Leopold Kompert. It is not sufficiently known that Graetz was one of the earliest Zionists. This is evident from his relation to his admirer, Moritz Hess,[7] the author of "Rom und Jerusalem," and from his remark on Judah Halevi's philosophy which he declares to be the only consistent conception of Judaism.[8] In the essay just quoted, he declares that the servant of the Lord in the prophecy of Isaiah is the people of Israel, and incidentally he remakrs that Judaism never taught a "thorn-crowned, bleeding Messiah." The natural thing for Sebastian Brunner would have been to declare that Graetz had attacked Christianity, but he was too clever a man to show his colors. Had he done so, he would have risked being denounced as a fanatic who desired to reintroduce the Inquisition. He therefore declared that Graetz, having attacked the belief in a personal Messiah, had libelled Judaism

[6]Jewish Encycl III, 404.

[7]Jewish Encycl. VI, 373.

[8]Geschichte der Juden, VI, 312, 3d-ed.

which was a religion recognized by the state. The prosecuting attorney, Lienbacher, who was a clerical politician, eagerly took the hint and brought action against Graetz as author and Kompert as publisher. The action against Graetz was a mere formality because, living in Breslau, he was not under the jurisdiction of an Austrian court. In the trial it was of greatest importance to ascertain, whether the belief in a personal Messiah was an essential doctrine of Judaism. Two rabbis, Isaac N. Mannheimer[9] and Lazar Horwitz,[10] were called as witnesses. The task was easy for Mannheimer, who belonged to the liberal school, but very difficult for Horwitz, who was an orthodox, and yet did not wish to play the game of the clerical politicians. He acquitted himself admirably, declaring that while in his opinion the belief in a personal Messiah was an essential doctrine of Judaism, he had to admit that the matter was a disputed point and that prominent theologians had held a different opinion. The court gave a verdict which was practically an acquittal, but in Orthodox circles the matter stirred up quite a storm. Numerous rabbis, under the leadership of Israel Hildesheimer,[11] who was then rabbi of Eisenstadt, published a protest against Horwitz as having betrayed Judaism. On the other hand prominent authors arose in defence of Mannheimer and Horwitz, amongst whom was also Isaac H. Weiss,[12] who just at that time had been appointed instructor in the newly established Bet Hamidrash.

[9]Jewish Encycl. VIII, 295-296.
[10]Ib. VI, 466-467.
[11]Ib. 395-396
[12]Nezah Israel, Vienna, 1864.

The purpose of this sketch cannot be to go into details, and therefore we shall confine our appreciation of Isaac H. Weiss to the presentation of his merits as historian in the "magnum opus" of his life, the history of rabbinic law, "Dor Dor we Dorshav", a work of five volumes in Hebrew with the German title, "Geschichte der Juedischen Tradition." The German title is rather awkward, but the plan of the book is quite clear. It purports to give a history of the Jewish religion in law, dogma, and in literature as far as it has a bearing on both. The task has peculiar difficulties. Our old Jewish sources lack the distinctness of biographical and historic material. Let us try an illustration by analogy. When Luther lays down the principle that faith alone can save, we know that just at that time indignation was aroused in Germany, because the Pope sent missionaries to Germany to sell indulgences in order to raise the funds for his extravagant building projects. This indignation expressed itself in a protest against the method of selling indulgences, and this again led to an investigation of the underlying principle. Condemning the principle of salvation by merely mechanical acts, one had to arrive at a positive platform which was, that faith alone can save. Let us apply the same principle to modern Jewish history. How is it that the first expression of Reform is not directed against any other dogma except the ultimate restoration of Israel to Palestine, and further that the introduction of instrumental music is a pivotal point of the controversy? We understand it in the light of a history, the details of which are all clear to us. We

know that after Waterloo the question of the political emanciption of the Jews became prominent, and that one point raised by the opponents was that the Jew himself, praying for the return to Palestine did not desire to become a citizen of the country in which he lived. This had to be met. We further know that the "Judenschul" was another point raised by the opponents in proof of the unfitness of the Jew to be a member of any occidental society. To meet this objection, decorum in the services was the highest aim of Reform.

We are unfortunately not so well informed about the condition of the Jews in Talmudic times. When a council of rabbis passed a resolution that in case of danger to life a Jew may transgress all laws, ecxept adultery, incest, and murder (Sanh. 74, a), Graetz[13] probably is right, when he says that this resolution was passed, when Hadrian compelled the Jews to desecrate the Sabbath, to transgress the dietary laws, and to neglect the study of the Law. At any rate whether he guessed correctly or not, the method which assumes that such differences are not mere academic discussions, but the results of an attempt to interpret Judaism according to the exigencies of the time, is correct. When Samuel, a Babylonian rabbi of the third century, declared (Berakot, 34, b) that the only difference between our days and the Messianic age was that in the Messianic age we shall have political freedom, he must have been actuated by some condition which required such a definition. The same is the case when Rabbi Hillel, probably living in Palestine in the 4th century, denied the com-

[13]Geschichte, IV, 157, 3d-ed.

ing of a Messiah (Sanh 99, b). In the latter case it is quite probable that this was a statement made in opposition to Christian claims. If the prophets never prophesied the coming of a personal Messiah, Christianity with its claim that a Messiah had come, was wrong.

This investigation into the history of rabbinic law and dogma was the work that Weiss did in five volumes, in which he presented this development of the Jewish religion from the earliest days to the end of the fifteenth century. He had originally intended to close with the fourth volume, that brought the development down to the era of Maimonides. He stated in his preface that this period closed the development and led to a decline. In the fifth colume he quietly ignored this statement and explained that he had thought of closing his work, because he was then in his 77th year. It was very fortunate that he gave us this continuation, and it would be desirable if somebody would continue this work down to our own time. A correspondent to the orthodox "Israelit"[14] at one time made the significant statement that history is "epikorsus" (infidelity). It is true. If the conception of Jewish law (Berakot, 5a, Megillah 19, b) which is found in old sources, that every Jewish practice was already revealed to Moses, and that all later development of the law was merely an interpretation, recording the oral teachings of older generations, be true, then history does not exist. Weiss was therefore often bitterly attacked. One of his strongest opponents

[14]1915, No.2.

was the recently deceased Isaac Halevy.[15] His work was hailed by the Orthodox as a refutation of the theories of Weiss and Graetz. Weiss was not a pioneer. Frankel and Graetz had preceded him, not to mention the numerous valuable contributions on individual questions of Jewish history, especially the brilliant monographs by Osias Heschel Schorr.[16] To Weiss, however, belongs the merit of having popularized this method, and having given to the public a readable book. Its merit is proven by the fact that his work went through various editions which is a rare occurrence in Jewish literature.

Personally this sketch is a tribute of gratitude that I owe to this teacher of mine. A very genial man, and a representative of that era of intense Jewish feeling that could make of a merchant a scholar, and of a scholar a merchant, showing the idealism inherent in the Jewish people. The class of scholars to which Isaac Hirsch Weiss belonged has died out, in western Europe at least, but their work will live.

[15]Author of דורות הראונים Presburg, 1897, Frankfurt a. M., 1901-1906. He died at Hamburg, May 15, 1914.

[16]Jewish Encycl., XI, 108-109.

ISAAC LOEB PEREZ.*

ONE of the results of the modern democratic evolution of Judaism is the appreciation of Yiddish as a medium of literary expression. About 1780 Moses Mendelssohn was called upon to render a decision on the form of oath prescribed in Prussia. He had no objection to the various humiliating features, such as the requirement that a Jew make affidavit that he considers it his duty to tell the truth even before a non-Jewish court, nor to the other subtle insinuations of anti-Jewish feelings found in this formula, but he would under no consideration tolerate the Yiddish of the older formula, declaring that this dialect is responsible for the degradation of the Jewish character.[1] Mendelssohn would surely have smiled if one had told him that a hundred and thirty years after his death, as was the case in the Bukowina in 1913, a regular professor of the University, Leon Kellner, considered not merely an authority as philologist, but also a recognized literateur, would advocate the recognition of Yiddish as a language in court and in the administration.[2] Thus matters change, and they change quickly, Steinschneider, who with the patience of a genuine scholar devoted himself to the study of the silliest work on folk medicine or to Arabic text books on Shehitah declares sarcastically that he is willing to forego the privilege

*The American Israelite, April 29, 1915.

[1]Gesammelte Schriften, V, 705. Leipsic, 1844.

[2]Oest, Wochenschrift, 1913, p. 77.

of studying the New York jargon literature and its dramatic productions[3]. Speaking once of Italian Jewish literature he praises the Italian Jews for having abstained from creating a "'Gemauschel" which awakens in us both disgust and pity for people who have no language of their own.[4] Gretz, whom Steinschneider so mercilessly attacks, agrees with his opponent on this point. Among the consequences of the Lateran council he counts the degeneracy of aesthetic judgment amongst the Jews due to the "jargon"[5].

This view has undergone complete revision. Our more democratic ideas have convinced us that all languages and dialects are capable of conveying the profoundest thoughts, and still more, of becoming means of expressing literary beauty. In order to impress us with this plain fact it was necessary for us to have masses of Jews concentrate in a limited section of a country, and to avail ourselves of a mechanical progress in printing which made it possible to produce literature at a popular price. For the very same reason no Yiddish literature of the age preceding the invention of the printing press has come down to us. Educated people in those days could read Hebrew, the uneducated could not read anything. When the printing press was first established, it took some years before the idea of printing works in Yiddish took root and then it was chiefly the prayer book, paraphrases of the Bible, and similar religious literature, intended for the unlearned, such as devotionals for

[3]Monatsschrift 42, 775, 1898.

[4]Ib. 43, 315, 1899.

[5]Geschichte, VII 19, 3rd-ed.

women, textbooks on Shehitah and dietary laws, that were put on the market. Very exceptionally a cheap adaptation of some popular novel was given to the public. This condition continued for centuries. Even the promotors of the Haskalah movement in the first half of the nineteenth century restricted their message to the Talmudists of the old school, whom they wished to raise from their intellectual isolation, therefore writing in Hebrew.

The real opportunity for Yiddish began when large masses of Russian and Polish Jews immigrated to England and the United States. Especially in the latter country the opportunity for the Yiddish stage appeared, which could exist only where thousands of patrons lived in the same place. The same may be said of daily newspapers, for which again a large concentrated population had to create the need as well as the means of existence.

To this age belongs Isaac Loeb Perez. We can appreciate him fully, if we limit ourselves to the statement that he gave us in a poetic setting the whole tragedy of Jewish life in the Pale, with its economic misery and its domestic virtue. As one of the gems of his pen I consider his touching sketch, "The Meshullach," which might approximately be translated "The Message-bearer." The Meshullach is an old man who in a country where mail service is undeveloped and express service unknown performs the work of both. Shemariah was a "cantonist." He had served for twenty-five years in the army, and had gone through all the hardships of a Russian soldier life. Discharged from the army, he returns to his

native place, where he obtained a position as night watchman in the revenue service. A change in the legislation lost him his position and he had to make a living by odd jobs, waiting at street corners for an order to move small households, to carry goods, or to go on errands into the country. On such an occasion he is surprised by a blizzard. Though quite an old man, he keeps on marching, figuring out how large a tip he would receive if the count, to whom he brings an offer for a consignment of wheat, would accept, and as the storm becomes severer he begins to calculate whether it would be better to invest that anticipated tip in a pair of spectacles or in a new fur jacket, and with this thought all the misery of his life comes back to him. He remembers his Sprinze, long dead, who in his prosperous day, when he had a steady job, would scold him, while when times became hard she would reserve for him the last crust of rye bread that was in the house, claiming that she had already had her meal, and as she grew weaker and weaker, knowing her end would come soon, she asked Shemariah not to forget her when he should come to the other world "not soon, but after hundred and twenty years" and to plead with "the court on high," to release her from the gallows on which she was very much afraid she would be hanged by her tongue for her habit of scolding. Shemariah, always marching bravely through the blizzard, says smilingly to himself, "She wasn't bad after all, and she did not dislike me either, though she would swear at me occasionally." Then he feels how his forces are forsaking him and he plans that he will not go at once to the castle, but

rather stop at the house of the only Jew at the village to get warm. He anticipates the odor of boiled potatoes and is sure of the invitation which will be extended to him to take part in this feast. Finally in spite of all efforts to keep on marching he feels that he must rest. He knows it is dangerous, but he will only sit down for a few minutes. As he does so he begins to dream and sees his sons who are scattered all over the world come back to him, they embrace him so heartily that he is forced to warn them, "Not so hard, boys, I am an old man and look out I have money in my pocket. I am an old man, and a poor man, but people trust me with any amount of money." Then he notices, how his Berl has a gold watch and chain and he regrets so deeply that poor Sprinze did not live to see that happiness. On the next morning Shemariah is found frozen to death, with his hand pressed firmly to his breast.

"The Meshuggener Batlan" is another of his productions that combine the pathos and the humor of the life in the Pale. Batlan is a peculiar term of shifting application. It originally means an idler, but is used for poor people who are without a definite occupation and support themselves by serving the occasional religious needs of the community. This Batlan had come to town as a deserted child and nobody knows exactly how he drifted there. He lives in the Beth Hamidrash, a place which is at the same time library, synagog, club house, shelter, and what not. His greatest grief is that he cannot marry. But there is hope. Cholera is raging in the neighborhood and is nearing the town. If it comes, the people

will try to ward off the plague by an act of charity. They will start a poor couple in life, marrying them in the cemetery in order to placate the angel of death. In this hope he shares the sentiment of a young physician, a Christian Pole, who not long ago settled in the town and is unable to build up a practice If cholera should come he will so distinguish himself that patients will flock to him afterwards. It is deeply touching to see how the two meet on their daily walk, and considerably hampered by their inability to speak each other's language, communicate their mutual fears and hopes. The monologues of the Batlan are full of the profoundest philosophy and through the medium of a European language would have long ago become one of the world's classics.

Equally pathetic is the sketch "Mendel Breine's." Mendel is a man of rather limited abilities, who as a boy in Cheder was nicknamed Mendel the Idiot. He had the good fortune of marrying Breine, an energetic woman who keeps a small grocery store, by which she supports a family. Mendel himself spends his days in the Beth Hamidrash, praying, studying popular religious literature, chatting and doing occasional charity jobs for the community, such as collecting money for an itinerant preacher, and the like. He thinks that he is working very hard, and so does his wife, who has a high opinion of Mendel's scholarship, and always has an extra dish for him so that his health shall not suffer from his devotion to the Torah, and she feels not only fully compensated but even proud of her lot when Mendel recites Maftir. The unconcern with which Mendel goes through this

world, his childlike inexperience, are responsible for his ignorance of his wife's declining health. It strikes him like a thunderbolt when his daughter comes running to the Beth Hamidrash screaming that mother has fainted and is in a critical condition. He never dreamed that Breine, who had such a happy life and such an easy time of it, could be ill. But now he declines visibly. He has turned grey and he never speaks of his favorite plan to go to Palestine as soon as his three daughters married, which matter, he felt, Breine his wife could attend. He had hoped to go to Palestine via England, because he had heard so much of the great industrial achievements of England, and particularly was he anxious to see the factories where they bore holes through straws, leaving around that hole such a thin wall that the slighest pressure will break it. It is a wonderful world with its domestic devotion, its active spiritual life and its blissful ignorance of the world's most important achievements, which Perez presents before our eyes.

His works are too numerous and too manifold to receive their due appreciation within the limits of a newspaper article. Quite wonderful are his fairy tales, quite touching some of his poems. His Hebrew writings would have secured him a lasting place in Jewish literature. One of his best productions is his presentation of Hasidic thought and life, sympathetic in spite of its satirical tone, and an expression of real philosophic thought. One little story of how the famous Rabbi Levi Yitzchok of Berdyczew overruled the sentence rendered by the divine court on Rosh Hashanah is a gem of humor and true religious

philosophy. The rabbi prays Musaf and suddenly stops as he is about to intone the anthem, "To God who acquires His Servants in Judgment." The rabbi stops, the letters in the book from which he reads are blurred, his devotion forsakes him, and the congregation is in agony. It takes quite a while before the rabbi resumes his devotion. The congregation knows that something terrible must have happened, and in the afternoon, while smoking his pipe, the rabbi tells his faithful ones what a fearful vision he had. The prosecutor in heaven carried heavy loads of sins into the room of the divine Beth Din, while Israel's advocate had only a small package of Mitzvos. The situation looked very critical. So the rabbi had to resort to an extreme measure. While Satan had turned his back for a moment, the rabbi took all the bales of sins and threw them through an open crevice into the Gehinnom, which had a holiday, as it always has when Israel is celebrating on earth, but the fire is kept flickering, and before Satan had turned around again the fire had consumed the whole load of sins which he had gathered as evidence for the prosecution. Then the little package of good deeds made the balance, and while Satan furiously demanded the rabbi's punishment as a thief, which required that he be a slave of Satan, God redeemed him, and at this very moment the rabbi understood the meaning of the words, "God acquires His Servants in judgment, and has compassion with his People on the Day of Judgment."

A charming satire is his "Kolbonik," everybody's friend. It is a sequel to "Chanteclerc." Two cocks

are fighting and the "Kolbonik" tells both in turn that he knew the other was unfair. The climax is reached when he whispers into the donkey's ear: "I can tell you confidentially that Kant was a charlatan."

The future of Yiddish, as means of literary expression, depends a great deal on political developments, and the present war may decide its doom. Even though full political emancipation will make it disappear in eastern Europe as it has disappeared in the west, and whether or not a Jewish state in Palestine will revive the Hebrew language as the language of the Jewish people, the productions of Perez will remain part of the world's classics.

SHALOM ALECHEM.*

An Appreciation

"ALAS poor Yorick, I knew him, a fellow of infinite jest, of most excellent fancy. Where be your gibes now? your gambols, your songs? your flashes of merriment that were wont to set the table in a roar?"

He is really dead. Those who knew him and loved him—and who could help loving him—feel, like Hamlet, "Alas poor Yorick!"

Yet it would be a grave injustice to compare a man like Shalom Alechem with a king's jester of post-mediaeval times, who in order to eke out an existence had to please idle rich, had to banish from crowned criminals the spectre of a remnant of conscience, who painted his face in ugly colors, dressed in outrageously combined patches and waived a child's rattle, being altogether more an object of pity than a source of merriment. Shalom Alechem was not a servant of the idle rich, but the benefactor of a multitude, writhing in misery, panting for a ray of sunshine in their life of infernal darkness.

On previous occasions—much as I hate to touch on personal matters—I was ridiculed, or let us put it more mildly, criticized for the eccentricity of taking interest in Yiddish literature. My reply was, and still is, that it is only the Philistine, the fellow with a dry soul, who cannot appreciate literary art in any garb in which it may be presented. I shall not dwell

*The American Israelite, May 25, 1916.

on this point. When I touched upon it, it was not for my own vindication, nor for the sake of criticizing others. It was done for the sake of laying down an axiom that must be admitted by anyone who does not renounce his claim to genuine culture.

Shalom Rabbinowitz, who died in New York on May 13, 1916, came to our shores as a fugitive from the terrible European War. Dependent on literary work for a living, he was deprived of his means of existence by the suspension of all Yiddish papers in Europe and, like many others, he fled in terror to one of the Scandinavian countries whence he came to America as the only place where a Yiddish author could expect to make a livelihood under the present conditions. For years he had been in poor health and the psychical as well as the physical strain of the life of an exile, together with the loss of a son who died in Copenhagen recently, consumed whatever vitality there was in his body already undermined by the ravages of tuberculosis, the dread disease of the Pale.

The story of the life of a Yiddish author is easily told. Shalom Rabbinowitz was born in a town in the Russian government of Poltava, in 1859. This is practically all that the Jewish Encyclopedia says of him. I may add the rest out of my own imagination, and the chances are, nine to one, that I am right. Rabbinowitz was the son of poor parents. He distinguished himself as a prodigy in Talmudic studies, when a child, and was married at an early age to the daughter of some village Croesus, who promised to educate the young man until he should be able to obtain a rabbinical position. The father-in-law failed

in business or died, and the young man, with a family of his own, was thrown on his own resources. He engaged in business, but unable to make a success, became a Hebrew teacher, eating from the tree of knowledge by reading the forbidden books of Hebrew authors of fiction and studying Russian and German. He began to write Hebrew essays and poems, which he sent to Hazefirah, Hameliz or Hashachar, but, compelled to depend on his pen for a living, he began to write in Yiddish and soon acquired fame as a humorist throughout the entire Yiddish speaking world.

To put it in a few words, Shalom Alechem was the Paganini of Yiddish literature. Like a cartoonist who is able to turn one face into expressions of the most different sentiments, Rabbinowitz was a master in handling the monologue of the garrulous man or woman of the Russian Pale. At one time it is the merchant who consults a specialist on stomach trouble. Without giving the doctor a chance to ask any questions he relates his whole history beginning with an account of how at one time he had rented a flour mill and ending with the statement that if he had an enemy the worst he could wish him was that he might become tenant of a flour mill unless, indeed, he might add the additional "Tsora" of a wife, and several marriageable daughters. Then he continues to relate his medical experiences, mentions the opinions and advice of all the doctors, he had consulted. He describes the medicines that he swallowed, taking it for granted that the famous doctor whom he now consults knows what kind of medicine he was given, when he tells him that it was a yellow-looking

powder, resenting the finally interposed desire of the doctor to examine his heart, with the statement: "My heart is all right, you will never find a poor man who hasn't got a good heart," and finally, taking leave, offers a rouble, which the doctor declines and which provokes a torrent of gratitude.

Another time it is a woman who comes to the rabbi to consult him about the misfortune that happened in her household when a pot in which farina was cooking with milk, and which had been placed next to another pot in which a quarter of a chicken was being prepared, boiled over. The important question is, whether or not a drop of this milk splashed into the chicken pot, thus making it "Trefah." It takes much longer time for her to tell the story than it does to give it here. In fact she does not tell the story at all, for by the time she would have been ready to come to the point, the rabbi has fainted under the flow of her oratory. She begins with her own history. She makes a living by buying poultry in the market and peddling it in the houses of the rich. Her husband was a sickly man and never was able to make a living. He died and left her one son, a good boy, who spends his whole day in the Beth Hamidrash. She would be happy, if only the boy did not cough. She consults one physician after another, but they want to know all about her husband, how old he was when he died and what his sickness consisted of, instead of giving the boy medicine that would stop the cough. These physicians don't understand their business. Instead of prescribing medicine they say the boy should not study. The

only sensible thing that the last doctor prescribed was that the boy should have chicken soup every day. It is a hard thing, but never mind, rabbi, he is going to have it every day. The mother knows how to economize in her household. She lives in one room, but why so extravagant? What should people do with one whole room all to themselves. She rents out part of the room to a family with children. Now the trouble began. These children were represented to her as real angels, but the "Not Good one" is an angel compared to them. To cap the climax, they have got a cat, and a cat, if it were only a cat, but it actually is an evil spirit materialized into a feline. One day they chased the cat, it jumps on the cupboard to escape from her tormentors, and throws down one of the two pots that Yente has. Now, you would imagine that of the two pots that were on the cupboard such a cat would select the one that was cracked, but no. It must smash the only good one in the house. Now the only other pot was used to boil the chicken in, and if the milk should actually have splashed into it, it would mean not only the loss of the quarter of a chicken, but of the only half serviceable kitchen utensil in her household.

This one story already shows the subtle talent of Rabbinowitz, reminding us of Dickens in his wonderful ability of combining deep tragedy with the finest humor. Perhaps the most touching of his productions is the story entitled, "The Easy Fast." Hayyim is the father of a numerous family. Living in one of the overcrowded towns of the Pale, he is unable to do anything for a living. The only breadwinners of the

family are two girls, working at starvation wages in a cigarette factory. Hayyim cannot eat, he feels with every bite he takes that he is living off the marrow and the blood of his children. There are two little girls in the family, who stand with longing eyes next to him, when he partakes of the supper, consisting of bread and herring. He cannot stand their longing looks, and passes them a bite of bread. The mother scolds the gluttons, who had their "supper" before, and Hayyim, feeling that he steals the bread from the mouths of his own children, devises another scheme. He claims that he has vowed to fast. Such practices are not infrequent in the pious Pale. He may have had a bad dream, whose effect he wishes to neutralize with a penance, or he may have inadvertently violated the Sabbath by carrying, unknowingly a handkerchief in his pocket, or he may have forgotten to insert a certain passage in the prayerbook prescribed for this particular day, or he may impose upon himself penance on the general principle, that every man is a sinner. It is remarkable how easily a man may become accustomed to such practices. These Americans are charlatans. A fellow, named Dr. Tanner, fills all the newspapers of the world with the announcement that he will abstain from eating for forty days. At the same time he is permitted to drink all the water he wants, and doctors come around, feel his pulse, take his temperature, and all that kind of nonsense. If Hayyim would be allowed to drink water he could live to the end of his natural days without any difficulty. So he

starts out to become accustomed to this practice on the first of Ab, to prepare himself for the great fast on the 9th of this month, held in commemoration of the fall of Jerusalem. He succeeds wonderfully. On the eve of the fast his wife urges him to take a bite, but he refuses. It is actually no bluff, he has no desire to eat. Wearily he drags his feet to the synagog, where he is the first one to arrive. He sits down on the steps, leading to the pulpit, and looks at the sun whose rays are dimmed, as they pass through the dust covered windows. A beautiful dream of happiness fills his soul. The Lord has seen his self-abnegation, and will send relief to his suffering family. With a look of transfiguration, the sexton finds him on his arrival. Hayyim's hope was fulfilled. He will have an easy fast. He needs nourishment no more.

Shalom Alechem's sojourn in America gave him an opportunity for some of his most brilliant sketches. Perhaps the best is "Berl Isaac's Experiences in America." Berl Isaac is the Muenchhausen of Kasrilevka, the Russian town in which Shalom Alechem's stories are placed. He has visited America, and returning to his native town he tells the astonished people about the wonderful things in the new world. There are the skyscrapers, in which only "Kantoren" —"Offitzes" they call them there—are found. You do not have to climb any steps, but sit down quietly in a kind of a cage, and they bring you up to the top of the building which is from three to four hundred stories high, so when you start on your journey in the morning, you arrive just in time for the afternoon

prayer. Money is no object. All you have to do is to take a "Lopata" (shovel), go out on the street and fill a pail for the needs of the day. Asked why he left such a wonderful country, Berl replies, "I came home for Jahrzeit." About the funniest thing is his description of funerals. If a man has a thousand dollars, all the rabbis and Hazans of the city—they call them "Reverenden" there—will follow the bier together with all the pupils of the Talmud Torah, who chant, "Righteousness goeth before him, and shall set us in the way of his steps." For a thousand dollars the word "steps" is emphasized, but for $500 they emphasize only the word "way." The people of Kasrilevka want to know how a poor man is buried, one who cannot pay even $500. Berl Isaac is not embarrassed. There are no rabbis, no "Reverenden." no Talmud Torah pupils, but the corpse, accompanied by two sextons, must walk to the cemetery. The most brilliant thing is the clever repartee of a Jew, from Kasrilevka, who meets a Christian on Easter Sunday. The latter, wishing to embarrass the Jew, greets him with the Easter salutation of the Greek orthodox church, "Christ has arisen." The usual answer is, "In truth he has arisen." The Jew makes this reply, but adds: "I know it to be a fact, for Berl Isaac told me so."

"Alas poor Yorick, I knew him, a fellow of infinite jest, of most excellent fancy."

HEINRICH HEINE.*

NEXT Saturday will be the semi-centenary of Heinrich Heine's death. Does he belong to Judaism? Three prominent authorities have answered the question in the affirmative. Zunz in his "*Monatstage*," gives Heine's death among the memorable dates of Jewish worthies. Graetz has devoted to him a chapter in the eleventh volume of his history, and Karl Goedeke, in his "*Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*," places him with Boerne, Ludwig Robert and Michael Beer, in one chapter, headed "Jewish poets." Of these four only one was buried in a Jewish cemetery; but such a caption equals a Hebrew inscription on a tombstone.

In determining a controversial point two methods are of equal value, the test of numbers and the test of weight. The latter proves Heine to be a Jew, and the former might be determined by an analogous case. Leo Kupernik, the prominent Russian barrister, died at Kieff October 12, 1905. Nine days later, on Shemini Azereth, at the memorial services, the El Male Rachamim was chanted at the synagog in memory of Aryeh Loeb ben Abraham Kupernik, although a cross had been erected over his grave bearing the name of Leo Kupernik. He was an apostate, but the synagog claimed him as her own, because in times of trouble, after the Kishineff affair and at the trial for ritual murder in Tiflis he had shown his devotion to the cause of the people whom he had forsaken.

*The American Israelite, February 15, 1906.

Leo Kupernik was stirred by the infamous lie that his former coreligionists killed children for religious purposes; he smarted under the calamity that befell them in Kishineff and Gomel, and he placed his great forensic ability at their disposal, refusing to accept an attorney's fee. It was a noble act, and Kupernik will be remembered with his countryman, Daniel Chwolson, with Paulus Cassel, Emanuel Veit, and the few, very few, other apostates who were manly enough to speak a word of truth in favor of those whose ranks they had deserted. Their names and their work will be known by students of Jewish history. Heinrich Heine belongs to the world. Anti-Semites like Treitschke and Bartels may vilify him, but they can not ignore him, and the man who wrote "Almansor," "Hebraeische Melodien," Rabbi von Bacharach," and, above all his "An Edom," was a Jew.

Ein Jahrtausend schon und laenger
Dulden wir uns bruederlich;
Du, du duldest, dass ich athme,
Dass du rasest, dulde ich.

Manchmal nur, in dunkeln Zeiten,
Ward dir wunderlich zu Muth
Und die liebefrommen Taetzchen
Faerbtest du mit meinem Blut.

Jetzt wird unsere Freundschaft fester,
Und noch taeglich nimmt sie zu;
Denn ich selbst begann zu rasen,
Und ich werde fast wie du!

The man who wrote these lines was certainly more of a Jew than he whom he made the target of his biting satire, the composer Meyerbeer, although the latter was buried in a Jewish cemetery. And he not only felt like a Jew, he suffered as a Jew. Smaller minds, like Platen, envious of his genius, Philistines like Menzel, snobs like his Goettingen fellow-students, made him feel "the woe of thousand years," of which he so touchingly sang.

Heinrich Heine was the descendant of an aristocratic Jewish family. Of his paternal grandfather, Hayim—Hayim was rendered in German by Heine, the colloquial form for Heinrich—Bueckeburg, we know very little; but his maternal grandfather, Dr. Gottschalk von Geldern, was one of the first Jewish graduates from a German university. Gottschalk's father, Jospe von Geldern, was the son of a court Jew of the Palatine elector and son-in-law of Simon Michel of Presburg, a favorite of the arch-fanatic, Bishop Kollonitz, to whose agitation was due the expulsion of the Jews from Vienna in 1670, and this very same bishop obtained for Simon Michel the favor to open a banking house in Vienna. After the marriage with Simon Michel's daughter, Jospe von Geldern moved to Vienna, whence he removed again to his native city of Duesseldorf. His oldest son, Simon von Geldern, the brother of Heine's grandfather, became a mystic, went to Palestine and returned several times, the type of the Palestine Schnorrer in those days, when schnorring could not be done by mail. He finally died as a tramp in Forbach, Lorraine. Something of this erratic genius

was inherited by his grand-nephew. In Simon von Geldern's diary an item of expenditure is found which is followed by a vow not to commit such a sin in the future. For the same sin Heinrich was expelled from the students' fraternity in Goettingen, to which he belonged.

More than these impressions from early childhood, the experiences of his youth filled him with Jewish sentiments. His academic life fell in the period of the reaction following the battle of Waterloo. "Legitimacy" became the watchword of shrewd politicians like Talleyrand and Metternich; "historic rights" were the fundamentals of philosophy of law, as expounded by Savigny; the reasonableness of "that which is" was taught by Hegel, the leading philosopher of the age. And as the wrongs from which the Jews had suffered for so many centuries were "historic rights," they had to be considered not only legitimate, but even just (vernuenftig).

At that time (1821) Heine came to Berlin and joined the society for the improvement of the Jews "*Verein fuer Cultur und Wissenschaft der Juden*," of which Eduard Gans, the jurist, was president, and Zunz one of the most active members. Heine never redeemed his pledge to contribute to the society's periodical, and, erratic as he was, made occasionally some satirical remarks about the aims of the society; but how deeply he felt for the cause to which it was devoted is seen from his condemnation of Gans' apostasy, of whom he says: "A true captain will be the last to leave his ship, or he will go down with it, while Gans was the first to jump ashore and to kick

the frail craft back into the raging sea." Similarly he honored himself by the glowing tribute which he paid to the sincerity of Zunz.

In judging Heine we must not forget that he was the "spoiled child of the Muses." Singing of the tragedy of human life, he will break off in the middle with a shrill discord or end with a farcical remark. So he has done in his "Rabbi von Bacharach," when he presents his Don Isaac Abrabanel, who loves the cooking of the Jews more than their religion; but in the same novel, unfortunately a fragment, in which he intended to portray himself, the Greek Jew, who thinks "of our lady of Sidon, the holy Astarte," while he kneels before the mother of him who is crucified, he speaks the touching words: "How poorly protected is Israel whose guardians are false friends from without and fear and folly from within."

Heine's information on things Jewish is very superficial, as was his whole education. He makes Judah Halevi the author of "Lecho Daudi;" he makes the baptized grandson of Isaac Abrabanel his nephew; he speaks of the schools of Hillel and Shammai in Babylonia; he lets his "Nasenstern" hop at the three "Kadosh," when he means the end of the Shemoneh Esreh ("Ausgehen"); he says that Shlemiel was killed by Phinеas, instead of Zimri, when he ought to have said that Shlumiel is identified with Zimri; he speaks of the Valois as having ordered the extraction of a tooth of a Jew every day, until he should pay a certain sum, while this happened in England under King John.

In spite of this superficiality in knowledge, Heine possessed the gift of the genius intuitively mastering

the principles without knowing the details. He presents his poor devil, Moses Luempche, in Hamburg, sitting at his table on Friday night, to whom Baron Rothschild offers the fulfillment of any wish; our Luempche is so happy that he has only the one wish, that the baron might send him some "Shabbesgoy" to trim his lamps. No one knowing by heart every one of the 1,705 sections of the Shulhan Aruck, with all its glossaries, could have presented Jewish sentiment more correctly.

True it is! Heine was not an ideal character. He was ashamed of his Judaism; he was snobbish, spiteful, vain, immoral; but he said himself on his deathbed: "*Dieu me pardonnera, c'est son metier.*" And so every Jew will feel, when he thinks of the great poet on the 17th of February, when fifty years will have elapsed since Heinrich Heine's heart ceased to beat, after eight years of suffering in his "matress grave."

FRANCIS JOSEPH.*

A HISTORIC personality passed away when the Emperor of Austria, at the advanced age of eighty-six, closed his eyes in the midst of turmoil which threatens the life of his country. His death is a tragic, though consistent end of a long and storm-tossed life to which history affords no parallel. No monarch in the whole record of authenticated history has ruled for sixty-eight years. The only instance quoted, that of Louis XIV of France, is not exactly parallel, for, while his reign nominally extends over seventy-two years, he began it at the age of five and therefore his life as actual king of France does not reach in extent any way near that of Francis Joseph.

To us, naturally, the relation of the Emperor to Jews individually, and to Judaism as a religion, is a matter of great historic interest. Almost the whole modern history of the Austrian Jews was enacted under the late Emperor's reign. Under his predecessor and uncle, the mentally defective, almost idiotic Ferdinand, the disabilities reaching back partly into mediaeval times were maintained. It is almost a jest of history, that on March 10, 1848, the all-powerful chancellor Prince Metternich, issued an order that the former "Judenamt," where all foreign Jews coming to Vienna had to report, be changed into "Fremdenamt."[1] This "liberal" move be made

*The American Israelite, November 30, 1916.

[1]Allg. Ztg. d. Judt. 1861, p. 325, 1869, 936. Wolf: Gesch. der Juden in Wien, p. 102, Vienna, 1876.

on the urgent insistence of the Prussian ministry, that the Jews coming to Vienna be treated better than was the custom. Perhaps the case of the composer Meyerbeer had something to do with it. Meyerbeer went to Vienna to conduct an opera of his that was to be produced at the Imperial Opera House. According to the existing law he, as a Jew, would have to report at the "Judenamt," state what his business was, and receive a permit entitling him to a sojourn of two weeks. The police authorities saw the ridiculous nature of such a rule and in their embarrassment changed it, declaring that Meyerbeer as a cavalier was exempt from these regulations.[2] Three days later the revolution broke out. Among the victims who were killed, when the troops charged the rioting citizens, was the Jewish student, Heinrich Spitzer.

The Jews took a prominent active part in this political movement. Among the leading men, and, one may say, the most popular man in Vienna at that time, was the young physician, Adolf Fischhof,[3] whose address to the masses was received with such enthusiasm that he was at once elected spokesman of the people, and as a concession to the popular movement, he was called into the ministry. Other prominent agitators were the poet Moritz Hartmann,[4] and the publicist, Sigmund Kolisch.[5] A provisional constitution was granted April 25th, and a Reichstag was convened in Vienna. These concessions, however, did not satisfy the people, and a new revolution broke

[2]Allg. Ztg. des Judts, 1847, p. 91.

[3]Charmatz. Adolph Fischhof. Das Lebensbild eines osterreichischen Politikers. Stuttgart, Berlin, 1910.

[4]Jew. Enc. VI, 244-245.

[5]ib. VII, 547-548.

out, which compelled the Emperor to leave the capital. The city was captured by the loyal troops of the Emperor under command of the Croatian general, Jellacic. Among the victims of the conqueror was Hermann Jellinek,[6] the brother of the famous preacher, who was executed, November 23rd. A contemporary, who was by no means partial to the revolution, reports that the execution of Jellinek was merely a ruse of the reaction, desirous to discredit the revolution by making it appear as having been engineered by Jews.[7] The Reichstag, which was first convened at Vienna, and afterwards transferred to the small provincial town of Kremsier in order to keep it away from the influences of the democratic movement in large cities, abolished the disabilities imposed upon the Jews, August 5th, and the special Jewish taxes, October 5th, in spite of the protest of the clerical party, especially of the bishops and of the clerical population of the province of Tyrol.[8] Meantime, especially owing to the open rebellion in Hungary, conditions were so critical that poor emperor Ferdinand could not possibly be expected to maintain order. He was advised to abdicate, which he promptly did, and the throne should have gone to his brother Franz Karl who, however, withdrew in favor of his oldest son, Francis Joseph, then eighteen years of age, who ascended the throne, December 2, 1848, thus lacking only eleven days, to complete a reign of sixty-eight years.

[6]ib. VII, 93.

[7]Springer: Gesch. Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Friedem, II, 585, Leipsic, 1863, Bauernfeld: Reminiscences, quoted in Jued. Volksblatt. Vienna, Dec. 4, 1903.

[8]Allg. Ztg. d. Judt, 1861, 264; 1867, 465.

The soul of the movement at the court was the young emperor's mother, the Bavarian princess Sophia, an ambitious woman, whose sympathies were exclusively on the side of reaction and clericalism. Under her influence advisors of the young emperor were chosen who educated him in ideas hostile to all democratic development. Prominent among them was his military adviser, Count Gruenne, and the supervisor of his education, the priest Rauscher,[9] who afterwards became the archbishop of Vienna. The principle of the new government evidently was to move slowly in the matter of repression. The Reichstag was dissolved and a new constitution, decreed by the emperor, was published March 4.[10] This constitution maintained the principle of full civic and political equality regardless of religion, and therefore the Jews had no immediate cause for complaint. The young emperor indeed evoked an expression of deep-felt gratitude from the Jews when, shortly afterwards, on April 3rd, he received the trustees of the Vienna congregation officially.[11]

To understand this peculiar situation one must remember that the Jews had been expelled from Vienna and the province of Lower Austria in 1670.[12] This expulsion was not maintained longer than fifteen years. Yet, as a matter of theory the Jews who were admitted to Vienna were considered as living under special grant. A congregation practically existed,

[9] Wolfsgruber: Kardinal Rauscher. Sein Leben und sein Wirken, Freiburg i. B., 1888.

[10] Reichsgesetzblatt, 1849, No. 151.

[11] Der Israelit, 1898, p. 1817.

[12] Kaufmann: Die letzte Vertreibung der Juden aus Wien. Vienna, 1889.

it had even in 1826 received as a special favor from old emperor Franz, the right to build a synagog,[13] but they were not a congregation in the legal sense, they were simply Jews living in Vienna and the trustees of the congregation were representative Jews. Now for the first time, the emperor in an official way, spoke of a Jewish congregation, and great indeed was the rejoicing of the Jews. There were, other quite favorable signs. The provincial government of Bohemia declared May 15th, that the old restriction on Jewish marriages was no longer valid, having been practically abolished by the constitution.[14] An individual event, but highly significant for the conditions of the time, was the appointment of Jacob Goldenthal[15] as extraordinary professor of Semitic languages at the university of Vienna. This event was followed two years later by the appointment of Wolfgang Wessely,[16] formerly a teacher at the Talmud Torah of Prague, as professor of criminal law at the university of that city. Neither of the two men seems to have been really a man of prominence.

This era of transition naturally was productive of a great many inconsistencies. While Jews were professors at the universities, and an order of the ministry of justice declared, that Jewish students were to be admitted to bar examinations, which would entitle them to hold positions as judges; another order declared that they could not take a full degree in law,

[13] Wolf: Vom ersten bis zum zweiten Tempel. Vienna, 1861.

[14] Allg. Ztg. des Judt, 1849, p. 353.

[15] ib. 1884, p. 15.

[16] Jew. Enc. XII, 507.

because they could not pass an examination in canon law. This order issued, November 21, 1852,[17] was in force for fully ten years, and it was not until 1862 that the aged president of the Jewish congregation of Prague, Dr. Arnold Rosenbacher, by the way, a strictly observant Jew, received the full degree of doctor of both laws, Juris utriusque.[18]

Reaction, however, was beginning to rear its head. The tendencies of the court and of the other reactionary forces, especially of the high clergy, received strong support in wide circles of the population. Nordau once well said, though as is his habit, in somewhat exaggerated tones, that the emancipation of the Jews was a sort of piano, which people laying claim to respectability have to have in their parlors, although they have not the slighest love for music.[19] It was so in Austria. The people who naturally suffered from the narrow reactionary government, demanded a constitution. When they had it, and certain cities from which Jews had been excluded for centuries, and certain other cities, which had restricted them to the ghetto, found that the Jews came in, or opened places of business in the best parts of the city, now protested, and thus gave encouragement to the tendencies of the government. When for instance the city of Krems in Lower Austria, in mediaeval times the seat of a prominent congregation, but since the fifteenth century not admitting Jews to residence, saw a number of Jews who took advantage of the new

[17] Wolf: Zur Gesch. der Wiener Universitaet, p. 144, Vienna, 1883.

[18] Allg. Zeitg. des Judt., 1862, p. 615.

[19] Das Judentum im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Cologne, 1910. Les Juifs et le Judaisme am XIX, Siecle. Paris, 1913.

law, and moved to the city, a regular riot broke out and the Jews were compelled to leave at once.[20] This act of lawlessness was made still more offensive by the fact that this expulsion occurred on Yom Kippur eve, and the Jews were compelled to spend the night of their holiest day in the open air. Thus the government had an excuse for saying that the full program of liberalism was not sustained by the will of the population. An order, issued October 2, 1853[21] declared that the right of the Jews to acquire real estate outside of the places formerly assigned to them as residence was temporarily suspended. In a similar manner the restrictions of marriages were again introduced. This was not done directly, but it was declared that the provision of the old civil code, which demanded of every Jew who took out a license to marry that he should bring a special certificate of the Kreisamt, was not abolished by the constitution.[22] The only difference between this and the former law was that the limitation of numbers of marriages permitted was not re-introduced. Reaction had become the recognized principle of the young emperor's policy. An order, issued December 31, 1851,[23] declared the constitution granted by the Emperor on March 4, 1849, abolished. For the moment it appeared this would not directly affect the Jews, for the Supreme Court rendered a decision in the following year which declared that by the repeal of the constitu-

[20] Neuzeit, 1861, p. 187.

[21] Reichsgesetzblatt, 1853, No. 199.

[22] Frankl-Gruen: Gesch. der Juden in Kremsier, II, 23, 30. Frankfort, 1898.

[23] Reichsgesetzblatt, 1852, No. 2.

tion the civic condition of the Jews was not affected.[24] Indeed, in spite of the later order, which took from the Jews the unrestricted right of holding property in places where they did not have the right of residence previous to 1848, the law was not strictly carried out.[25] The population of the capital increased rapidly and the building of a second temple became necessary. The first temple, opened in 1826, was built under peculiar restrictions. As the Jews had no corporate rights, they could not have a synagog, as previously stated, but were only permitted to worship in private houses (Betstube). By the usual method of bribery and personal favoritism one of their leaders obtained, through the claim that the present "Betstube" was unsafe, the right to build a synagog, but only under the condition that the front of the house should not show any signs of its character and purpose.[26] This law, by the way, affected the Protestants as well as the Jews. But now, in spite of reaction, this precaution was no more necessary. An imperial order, dated May 2, 1854,[27] allowed the building of a new synagog, which was the first large synagog built in Vienna after the expulsion of 1670, and to which a year afterwards the famous preacher, Adolf Jellinek, was called.

The principle followed by the authorities seems to have been that while the Jews as a religious body should obtain encouragement, individuals seeking recognition as citizens with equal rights were to be

[24] Neuzeit, 1867, p. 277.

[25] Allg. Zeitg. des Judt, 1853, pp. 491, 598, 543.

[26] Wolf: Von Ersten bis zum Zweiten Tempel, p. 121, Vienna 1861.

[27] Allg. Zeitg des Judt. 1854, p. 321.

restricted. It was in accordance with this principle that the minister of education, Count Leo Thun, a determined clerical, introduced by an order of February 11, 1852,[28] religious instruction in secondary schools as a prescribed part of the curriculum. The state in this case merely furnished schoolroom facilities, and gave the mark in Jewish religion the same value which the mark in other subjects possessed. It was not until twenty years later, in 1872, under a liberal ministry, that means were appropriated to pay the teacher out of public funds.[29] It was in harmony with the policy of Count Thun, that a warden of a penitentiary had a Jew flogged for eating bacon.[30] It may have been, on the other hand, a method of extricating the government from a delicate position, when a Jewish applicant for employment in the postal service was told that his application could not be considered unless he produced a certificate of his rabbi, that he was permitted to write on Sabbath.[31]

Reaction had come to a climax when on the Emperor's twenty-fifth birthday, August 18, 1855, the concordat was proclaimed,[32] which re-established mediaeval conditions, giving the church rights which she claimed away back in the middle ages. While the civic rights of the Jews were not affected by this new move, their hopes of recognition in public life were shattered, for according to the new law only professing Catholics could hold public office, or be

[28]ib. 1853, p. 260.
[29]ib. 1872, p. 892.
[30]ib. 1877, 463.
[31]ib. 1851, p. 19.
[32]Annual Register, 1855, p. 279.

employed in schools. This concession on the part of the young emperor, was ascribed chiefly to the influence which his former tutor, Archbishop Rauscher, exercised over him and his mother. Similar influences had become noticeable long before. Not only were silly old laws, which found their imitation even in Protestant Prussia, and were dictated more by political than by religious motives, revived, like the law that Jews were not permitted to assume the names of Christian saints,[33] but in more serious matters the spirit of mediaevalism became evident. An order which reaches back to the thirteenth century, when the Council of Vienna, in 1267,[34] reiterated the rule passed by the Lateran council of 1215, that Jews must not employ Christians as their domestic servants.. This order, issued repeatedly, was now renewed—and here again is a case which confirms the importance of detail in historic research—on June 4, 1859.[35] The date is of great significance in two directions. A year previously the famous Mortara case had occurred. A papal guard had entered the house of a Jewish citizen in Bologna and kidnapped the six-year-old, Edgar Mortara, under the plea that he had been baptized by his nurse girl four years previously.[36] This case became a European sensation, and the excuse of the clerical party in lands where they needed any excuse was that the father of the boy had violated the law of the state, which prohibited the employment of Christian domestics by

[33]Allg. Zeitg. des Judt., 1853, p. 610.

[34]Scherer: Rechtsverhaeltnisse de Juden, etc., p 332. Leipsic 1901.

[35]Allg. Ztg. des Judt, 1859, p. 639.

[36]Jew. Enc. IX, 35-36.

Jews. It is sad to admit that individual Jews, as is so often the case, used this opportunity for self-aggrandizement, regardless of the injury done to the common cause. Ignatz Deutsch, a court banker, who enjoyed the confidence of the powerful archduchess Sophia, the mother of the emperor, issued a circular to the rabbis, warning them against taking part in the protest against this scandalous revival of mediaevalism. He sent a copy of this circular to Minister Thun, advising him that the whole agitation against the concordat in general, and against the action of Pius IX in particular, was merely staged by the reformers who are democrats, and are undermining all authority, religious as well as secular.[37] This incident, which required an apology, even in Catholic Austria, is responsible for the revival of a prohibition against keeping Christian domestics. It was issued on June 4, on precisely the same day when the Austrian troops suffered a decisive defeat on the part of the allied French and Italian troops at Magento. A few weeks later a second defeat followed at Solferino, and Austria began to negotiate for peace. It is significant again, for the importance of accuracy in historic detail, that on August 22,[38] the emperor issued an order for the revision of the law on Jews,[39] and on November 29, about two weeks after the peace of Zurich had been concluded, an imperial order abolished the restriction on Jewish marriages that had been

[37]Isr. Levi Kohn: Zur Geschichte der juedischen Tartueffe, Leipsic, 1864. Wolf: Judentaufen in Oesterreich, p. 164. Vienna, 1863.

[38]Frankl—Gruen: Gesch. der Juden in Kremsier II, 32. Frankfort, 1898.

[39]Reichsgesetzblatt, 1859, No. 217.

reintroduced by the order of 1853. This picture of the conditions would be one-sided, were we not to state that just then there was a strong current in the population towards liberalism, while afterwards when the government became liberal, the population became reactionary. In 1859, the Vienna poet, O. E. Berg,[40] whose real name was Ebersberg, wrote a comedy under the title "Einer von unsere Leut,' " which had a most remarkable success. It has been aptly called the Vienna version of Lessing's "Die Juden." It was a senastional, but just for this very reason, effectual plea for religious toleration, and was successful not merely in Vienna, where it presented the local color, but even in Berlin, where it was adapted to local conditions. It is sad to say, however, that in 1886, long before his death, the same Berg became an antisemite, and published the antisemitic, humorous paper, "Der Kikeriki."

The defeat on the battlefield and the critical condition of the state's finances necessitated a return to liberalism and the emperor called a liberal, Schmerling, as minister, and a law, published February 18, 1860,[41] abolished all civic restrictions, with the exception of some in which the Jews as a mass were not interested. It was chiefly done with regard to Galicia under the plea that her Jews were so backward that they did not deserve full recognition, and also in order to spare the feelings of the bigoted Catholics of the Alpine provinces. It is also characteristic that the same Schmerling afterwards, in 1880,[42] while fighting the

[40]Neue Freie Presse, July 23, 1905.

[41]Allg. Zeitg. des Judt., 1860, p. 144.

[42]ib. 1880, p. 361.

aspirations of the Slavic nationalities, appealed for recognition of German, on the ground that at present the Jews are the only nationality who in Slavic sections of Austria understand the German, and that therefore they have a better chance of appointment as non-commissioned officers than their fellow countrymen. Schmerling supported this plea with the statement: "I am not so very fond of the Jews either." Another sign of improvement was that in 1861 the emperor called Anselm von Rothschild[43] into the Upper House of the reconstructed Parliament, the first Jew to hold that position. This appointment was followed by quite a number of others, and it is also noteworthy that while originally the only representatives of the Jews in the Upper House were financiers, we have had since 1902 a number of university professors, who were raised to this exalted position. The Reichsrat, as it was then called, was not composed of members elected by direct vote, but of delegates of the various diets. To most of the diets in provinces inhabited by Jews, Jewish members were returned, but only from the diet of Lower Austria, two Jews, Kuranda[44] and Winterstein,[45] were returned to the Reichsrat. Yet the members were so bent upon displaying their liberalism, that for the sake of these two members, the Reichsrat suspended its sessions on Yom Kippur, 1863.[46] The clericals naturally continued their agitation and quite symptomatic of the period is the libel suit brought by the

[43]ib. 1861, p. 557.

[44]Jew. Enc. VII, 584-585.

[45]Ib. XII, 536.

[46]Allg. Ztg. des Judt, 1863, 635.

editor of a clerical paper, Sebastian Brunner, against Graetz and Kompert.[47] This libel suit has a most remarkable history. It shows us the clerical intrigue to perfection. At that time Leopold Kompert, known as a ghetto novelist, published a Jewish year-book. To this Graetz contributed an essay called "The Rejuvenation of the Jewish Race.[48] Graetz, who was a Zionist before Zionism existed[49] and an intimate friend of Moritz Hess,[50] presented in this essay his view of Isaiah's Messianic idea. The Messiah, whom the prophet announces, is according to Graetz, no one else but the people of Israel, and in this connection, he makes a sarcastic remark against the belief in a suffering Messiah, crowned with thorns. This gave Sebastian Brunner an opportunity to show to the world that it is not Judaism which is persecuted, but that it attacks Christianity. He might with perfect right according to the law, and with complete hope for success, have brought suit against Graetz for having libelled Christianity. This, however, did not suit the Jesuitic mind. He did not wish to be decried as a persecutor, as a new grand inquisitor, and therefore turned the tables and brought suit against Graetz for having libelled Judaism, because he had ridiculed one of the dogmas of Judaism, that of the belief in a personal Messiah. The suit resulted in a nominal fine for Kompert, while the action against Graetz was a mere formality, because living outside

[47]Jew Enc. III, 404.

[48]ib. VI, 66.

[49]See his remark on Judah Halevi's philosophy which he calls the only correct interpretation of Judaism. Geschichte, VI, 132, 3d ed.

[50]Jew. Enc. VI, 373.

the jurisdiction of the Austrian courts he could not be punished at all.

Shortly afterwards, in 1866, Austria suffered a crushing defeat in the war with Prussia, and its ruler was for the first time after six hundred years, forced out of the federation of German states. As far as the Jews were concerned, this defeat brought a return to liberalism, and the new consititution, proclaimed December 21, 1867,[51] under the title of "Staatsgrundgesetze" removed all disabilities that had been maintained in the law of 1860. A new liberal school law, proclaimed in 1868, made the school independent of the church, and gave to Jews the right of appointment as teachers in public schools. It is quite interesting from the point of view of the inconsistency of reactionary parties that Jews were tolerated as professors at universities, but could not teach in a village school. A similar concession was their admission to judiciary appointments. The clerical party, led by Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague, protested against all these innovations, but without success. The population did not support the clerical aspirations. It is quite remarkable, and again a sort of humiliation, that in 1876, Adolf Fischhof, the aged leader of liberalism, was congratulated upon his sixtieth birthday by the German party, under the leadership of Georg von Schoenerer.[52] We might quote in this connection that even in 1884, the city council of Vienna congratulated Sir Moses Montefiore upon his hundredth birthday.[53] Matters changed

[51]Reichsgesetzblatt, 1867, No. 142.

[52]Charmatz: Adolf Fischhof, p. 295. Berlin 1910.

[53]Allg. Ztg. des. Judent. 1884, p. 733.

considerably afterwards. Schoenerer became the head of an antisemitic party, that based its policy upon racial grounds, fighting clericalism as well as liberalism. History has its whims. It was found out that von Schoenerer's wife was a great granddaughter of one Shmul Loeb Kohn, whom quite a number of people, living at that time remembered as having officiated as Kohen in the little Moravian town of Pohrlitz.[54] Another whim of history was that Schoenerer, who could allow himself the luxury of being a professional politician, had inherited his money from his father, who had earned it through the house of Rothschild in whose service he had made a million as railroad contractor.

Officially, however, we were in the midst of liberalism, while in Germany, since 1878,[55] with the beginning of Stoecker's career, antisemitism was created. A Vienna paper[56] said at that time: that fortunately we had nothing to fear from such reactionary tendencies. Vienna with its "Gemuetlichkeit" has not the soil for such mob agitation as is found in Berlin. It soon changed, however. The first impetus came from the German chauvinists, under the leadership of Schoenerer, who was in those early days joined by Lueger.[57] Lueger, an ambitious young politician, who had risen from the lowest strata of society, being the son of a janitor, saw very soon that the chauvinistic party could not expect a large following among the people of Vienna, and still less

[54]ib. 1888, p. 9.

[55]Jew. Enc. I., 644.

[56]Allg. Ztg. d. Judt., 1881, p. 77.

[57]ib. 1888, 221-223.

so in the provinces. He therefore joined the clericals, who at once raised him to an exalted position. Francis Joseph was a gentleman, and despised mob policies, and therefore, in spite of his own strictly Catholic convictions, he had no use for Lueger and even his clerical supporters. On various occasions, when on his travels he received a deputation of the clergy of the town, be would exhort them to toleration.[58] How serious he was in this respect was clearly demonstrated when in 1895 after Vienna had become officially antisemitic and Lueger was twice elected mayor,[59] the emperor refused to confirm him.[60] He never hesitated to speak out his mind to Jews. So he strongly condemned antisemitism in a conversation with the Jewish painter, Leopold Horovitz,[61] who several times painted the Kaiser's portrait, and he expressly permitted that his views should be published.[62] Similarly he expressed himself to Chief Rabbi Guedemann, on whom he bestowed rather ostentatiously a high decoration, and to whom he said in private audience. "Your coreligionists may be confident that the present movement is not going to last."[63] While as a constitutional monarch, he had to tolerate Lueger as burgomaster, and had to bestow on him the title of privy councillor, we cannot consider it entirely political expediency that he raised individual Jews to high offices. The elevation of the Jews to the peerage

[58]Neuzeit, 1884, p. 336.
[59]Allg. Ztg. des Judt. 1889, p. 791.
[60]ib. 1895, p. 554.
[61]Jew. Enc. VI, 467.
[62]Oest. Wochenschrif., 1903, p. 606.
[63]Allg. Zeitg. des Judt., 1897, No. 20.

and the bestowal of high decorations, as well as of titles of nobility on Jewish financiers and scholars, might not be considered as a matter of great importance, but the fact that Jews rose to high ranks, not merely in civil appointments but also in the military, while in Germany they were denied this privilege, is certainly a matter of considerable importance. About six Jews were raised to the rank of general in active service, not including those who reached the same rank in the medical corps of the army.[64] The first Jew was admitted to the bench in 1868,[65] and others have since been elevated to as high a rank as that of Oberlandesgerichtsrat, one of them serving on the Supreme Court,[66] and quite a number occupied high positions in the ministries, amongst them Arthur Kuranda,[67] son of the beforenamed politician and publicist.

It is a matter of etiquette, and therefore not of great political moment, that he visited a synagog in every city, where he made a longer stay, or a Jewish hospital, or an orphan aslyum, or accepted an invitation to be present at the dedication exercises of such an institution, but it is more than mere etiquette that on various occasions he expressed his delight publicly and unhesitatingly at the defeat of an antisemitic candidate, and warned against such agitation, both in municipal and in state elections. It is a well authenticated story that in 1853, he noticed a Jewish non-commissioned officer, who had a high medal for

[64]Biographisches Handbuch der in der k. u. k. oest.—Ungar Armee aktiv gedienten Offiziere. Vienna, 1911.

[65]Neuzeit, 1868, p. 315.

[66]Neue Nationalzeitung, 1913, No. 16.

[67]Allg. Ztg. d. Judt., 1889, p. 9.

bravery, and he inquired at once why this man, who had won this distinction on the battle field of Magenta had not been promoted to a commissioned rank. When told that the man could not be promoted because he was a Jew, the emperor indignantly asked him to step to the front, and at once bestowed upon him the rank of first lieutenant. This story, told at that time in the "Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung,"[68] was repeated to me by a Christian eye witness. In 1900, he visited Galicia, and saw a Polish Jew dressed in a Kaftan, who possessed also the decoration won at Magenta. The emperor spoke to him and ordered a special pension for him. His name was Abush Weiss of Brzozow.[69] It is certainly significant that on the same day when the emperor confirmed the election of Lueger as mayor of Vienna, he bestowed the cross of a knight of Francis Joseph on chief rabbi Guedemann.[70] There can be no doubt that this was meant as a demonstration, that while yielding to Lueger's election as a political necessity, he was by no means willing to accept the antisemitic program.

Francis Joseph undoubtedly must have left quite a large Jewish library. Innumerable are the sermons and Hebrew poems published on the occasion of one of his numerous anniversaries, as on his twenty-fifth, or on his fiftieth and sixtieth anniversaries, on his silver wedding, and on similar occasions, including the many tragic events of his life. While there is in these things a great deal of convention and silly ambition, even these productions are testimonials of the well deserved

[68] Ib. 1853, p. 542.
[69] Ib., 1900, No. 40.
[70] Ib. 1897, No. 20.

loyalty of all Austrian Jews to the emperor, and this refers to the Hungarian part of the monarchy as well as to the Austrian. At the beginning of his reign when, after a hard struggle, the Hungarian revolution was crushed with the aid of Russia, the Jews were considered a dangerous element, and heavily fined. A few years later the emperor remitted the fine and applied the money collected for a rabbinical seminary in Budapest, which was opened in 1877. Surely, it is significant that the burgomaster of the capital, Budapest, a few years ago was a Jew whom the emperor also raised to the rank of a peer of the kingdom.

Francis Joseph's name will be forever remembered with gratitude in Jewish history.